

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill H. R. 3710 for the relief of Jacob Wilkes Beasley, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3740. A bill to expedite the issuance of marriage licenses in the District of Columbia to members of the armed services and merchant marine; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3742. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3743. A bill to permit the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for the teaching of the English language in the German nation after the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of H. B. Gilliam and C. E. Ellis, receivers of the Quantico Co., Inc., for balance of purchase price, rentals, and interest for lands used and occupied by the United States Marine Corps at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3745. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3746. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain land within Des Moines County, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3780. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3781. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 25 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3782. Also, petition of A. F. Louis and 52 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to

enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3783. Also, petition of the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 44 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3784. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 125 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3785. Also, petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 292 citizens of St. Louis, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3786. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3787. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the employees of the Gorsart Co., of New York City, favoring the adoption of the resolution which provides for the creation by the President of a commission to effectuate a plan to rescue surviving European Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3788. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of E. D. Reagan and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, source of the light that never fails or fades, we would yield the flickering torch of our insufficiency to Thee. Apart from Thee all is darkness and death. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, of swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, of evil forces let loose in the earth whose hideous cruelty stabs our anguished hearts, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us; we must find a strength not our own or our feet will slip in this overwhelming flood.

We long for Thy life to flow through our anxious and weary hearts. Into Thy brooding presence we would lift up in this hallowed moment the thronging duties which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting Thy children in all the world for which our human wisdom finds no answer. Anoint and cheer our soiled face with the abundance of Thy grace. Strengthen our faith in each other. Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might in this dread hour. Guard our lips from chilling criticism which may wound some comrade plodding

bravely by our side. Bring our spirits into captivity to that which is high and holy and of good report. Spurning and scorning the unworthy may we rejoice only in the fair and fragrant virtues of an honor untarnished. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR BY JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement issued by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States embodying a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States in tribute to our late beloved colleague, Senator Barbour. The resolution emphasizes the contribution by my late colleague to the fight against intolerance, and his efforts in behalf of Jewish war veterans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW YORK.—The memory of the late Senator W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was honored "as a loyal American and as a true friend of all minorities" by a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, it was announced by Archie H. Greenberg, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

The resolution pointed out that Senator Barbour had introduced a recent bill to admit 100,000 refugees into the United States; that he had introduced another bill to bar subversive literature from the mails; that he was cochairman with William Allen White of the Council Against Intolerance; and that he had introduced a resolution in the Senate to grant the Jewish War Veterans its national charter.

The resolution, copies of which were sent to the family of Senator Barbour and the United States Senate, follows:

"Whereas the late W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was a loyal American and a true friend of all minorities; and

"Whereas in his long career of public service he consistently espoused legislative action

to implement the principles of American fraternity and equality; and

"Whereas all believers in the fundamental principles of American democracy were heartened by 2 bills recently presented to the Senate by Senator Barbour, 1 bill which would admit 100,000 refugees into the United States and the other which would bar subversive literature from the mails; and

"Whereas as cochairman with William Allen White of the Council Against Intolerance, Senator Barbour was a valiant leader in the fight against intolerance of all minorities; and

"Whereas we of the Jewish War Veterans owe him a debt of gratitude for introducing a bill in the United States Senate to grant our organization its national charter: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, an organization representing 250,000 Jewish veterans of the First World War, adopt this resolution expressing our sincere sympathy to the family of the late Senator Barbour on his untimely passing, and that we express our conviction that Senator Barbour was an outstanding American statesman, a true exponent of the American principles of democracy; and be it further

*Resolved*, That National Commander Archie H. Greenberg forward copies of this resolution to the family of the late Senator Barbour and to his colleagues in the United States Senate."

#### SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY— CREDENTIALS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. ARTHUR WALSH, appointed by the Governor of New Jersey to succeed the late Honorable W. Warren Barbour as Senator from New Jersey. I ask that the credentials be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

#### STATE OF NEW JERSEY—CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

TO the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of New Jersey, I, Charles Edison, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint ARTHUR WALSH to be Senator of said State to represent said State of New Jersey in the Senate of the United States, until the vacancy therein caused by the death of W. Warren Barbour is filled by election on November 7, 1944, as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Gov. Charles Edison, and our seal hereto affixed at Trenton this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1943, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

By the Governor:

CHARLES EDISON,  
Governor.  
[SEAL] JOSEPH A. BROPHY,  
Secretary of State.

#### APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move that the House amendment to Senate

bill 1410, with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL. What is the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is the bill which removed a limitation of service of a certain number of years which exists in the law at the present time before an officer can be promoted.

Mr. HILL. Has the bill just come over from the House?

Mr. AUSTIN. It has.

Mr. HILL. I have not myself examined it. Is the House amendment unacceptable? Is it contrary to what the Senate Committee on Military Affairs thought to be the real purpose of the bill? Does it defeat the real purpose of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am unable to answer the question. The purpose of my motion is to ascertain the views of the committee regarding the House amendment.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I have no objection to ascertaining the views of the committee. As the distinguished Senator knows, when the Senate passes a bill and the House amends it, ordinarily we either concur in the amendment or the bill is sent to conference. We do not ordinarily send the matter to committee. So I really wondered why the Senator was seeking to have this matter sent to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think some other method might be pursued than sending the bill to conference. I think, perhaps, the committee has several courses it might take. It might report favorably the House amendment. It might report an amendment to the House amendment. If I may refer to the amendment for a moment, I call attention merely to one point. The new matter suggested by the House is in this language:

*Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of the total authorized number of brigadier generals of the line may be appointed, without regard to length of service, from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and whose names are borne on such eligible list.

I am not sure that I have covered the whole amendment, but I think I have. I have not had time to look over it. The House amendment has just been laid before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. It has just come over from the House, as I understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. It has.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I have no objection to the full committee passing on the matter. My reason for asking the Senator the question was that ordinarily we do not send a bill back to a committee, as I have stated. We ordinarily send it to conference, or concur in any amendment the House may have made. I suppose there will be a meeting of the full committee at an early date to pass on the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I assume there will be a prompt meeting of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

#### RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF CONNECTICUT CONCERNING WORLD FEDERATION

Mr. MALONEY presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is necessary at the present critical juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing some form of a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and to enable mankind to live in peace and to be free; and

Whereas it has become necessary for certain nations of the world to unite and cooperate to win the war, it is just as necessary and important that they should unite and cooperate to see that a lasting peace is secured for the benefit of all nations; and

Whereas the ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science and by the growth of spiritual, social and economic forces make no longer possible the political isolation of nations; and

Whereas nationalism alone has proven tragically incapable of preserving the rights and liberties of man and of protecting his life and property; and

Whereas history has revealed many instances by which free peoples inhabiting extensive territories without impairing their local autonomy have, through a federation or union of such peoples, acted together for the great benefit of all thus united and have thus preserved the whole without destroying any of its parts; and

Whereas such a union, federation, or commonwealth would vitalize all nations, members thereof, by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination or of wars; and

Whereas such a federation, union, or association of nations would reduce to its ultimate minimum the possibility of the occurrence of war, and mankind, saved from fear of conquest and released from the paralyzing expenditure of wealth and effort for endless war, would be free to give its full energies and intelligence to the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of all the people of the earth; and

Whereas the first step in achieving such protective security is the formulation of a constitution under which such a federation or union of peoples would operate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut does hereby declare itself in favor of the principle that all the peoples of the earth should upon the successful termination of the present world conflict or as soon as possible thereafter be united in a federation, union, league, or commonwealth of nations, providing the proposed articles of federation, union, league, or commonwealth of nations is possible without departure from the principles of constitutional liberty as established by irrepealable law in the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the General Assembly hereby requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Connecticut to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States, approving the principle of world federation or of some form of world cooperation under law, and requesting the President of the United States to initiate at the proper



time the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for such a federation, union, or league of the peoples of the world, which shall be submitted to the people of each nation for its ratification; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Connecticut.

#### FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR LEBANON

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram I have received from Mrs. George Whibey, president, and Mrs. Abdullah Hamrah, secretary, of the United Ladies Lebanese Syrian American Society of Waterbury, Conn., relating to the Republic of Lebanon.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERIDEN, CONN., November 22, 1943.

Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY,  
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

We believe that the present status of the Republic of Lebanon should be free of any foreign influence and not remain under the French mandate. We are a few of the many loyal citizens of the United States who reside in Connecticut and are proud of the many sons we have in the services. While we are of Lebanese extraction we still have many friends and relatives living in Lebanon and we prevail upon you to use your good office to maintain the promise made by the French commissioner to the Lebanese people to make Lebanon a free and independent republic.

UNITED LADIES LEBANESE SYRIAN  
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF WATERBURY,  
Mrs. GEORGE WHIBEY, President,  
Mrs. ABDULLAH HAMRAH, Secretary.

#### PERSECUTION OF THE ARMENIANS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing at this point in the RECORD a letter embodying a resolution which was passed unanimously at a mass meeting held by the Armenian-American citizens of Hartford, Conn., on November 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,  
November 18, 1943.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a mass meeting held by the Armenian-American citizens of Hartford, Conn., on November 14, 1943, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"Whereas recent information from Turkey through press correspondence and private letters reveals that the Turkish Government has launched a new persecution campaign against the non-Islam elements, especially the Armenians, through the enactment of an unjust wealth-taxing law; and

"Whereas those who are unable to meet the imposed tax are forced to forfeit their property including personal belongings, while the head of the family is sentenced to hard manual labor in the interior of Anatolia, being subjected to extreme hardships resulting in illness and death; and

"Whereas this is not an economic policy of the Turkish Government but a plain plan

for the annihilation of the Armenians following a similar plan in the First World War, earnestly call your attention to this serious matter and urge you to intercede with our Government to exert its restraining influence upon the Turkish Government in order to make an end of these persecutions. We are confident that our Government will not stay indifferent to this inhuman act of the Turkish Government against a defenseless people whose only fault has been their devotion to Christianity and civilization."

Very truly yours,

PETER RUSTIGIAN,  
Chairman of Mass Meeting.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1427. A bill to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 546); and

S. 1544. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 547).

#### THE ALASKA HIGHWAY (REPT. NO. 548)

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I submit a report adopting the report made to the full committee by a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself. The report is submitted under authority of Senate Resolution 161 agreed to July 1, 1943, and relates to a study of the Alaska Highway. I ask that the report may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 27, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

J. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.;

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1551. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1552. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make provision for payment of compensation to certain unemployed World War No. 2 veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3687, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMITH and Mr. DANAHER each submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. FERGUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

# FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1944—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 23, after line 8, insert the following:

"That the section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 133, 78th Cong., p. 22), which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to purchase United States Treasury War bonds for the membership of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury Series E War bond of the denomination of \$500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to a roll of said tribe prepared as of July 12, 1943, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and to pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the principal of the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Each bond shall be registered by the Treasury Department in the name of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in trust for the enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe for whom purchased and shall be held by the United States until the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be redeemed and the proceeds thereof paid to the Indian owner free of any trust or restriction. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner, the proceeds of said bond at maturity shall be distributed to his devisees or heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales."

## FIRE INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND FIRE LOSSES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning at a session of the Committee on the Judiciary I presented some statistics showing the average rate of premiums for fire insurance in the various States and Territories of the United States, the losses paid per \$100 of insurance, and the percentage of such losses paid to the premiums. A great deal of interest was manifested in these tabulations, which were taken from the record of fire insurance by States, as published annually by the Weekly Underwriter. In order that members of the committee and of the Senate may have access to the complete statement, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

# Fire-insurance premiums and fire losses by States—Stock companies [10-year average 1931-40]

State	Average rate of premiums per \$100	Losses per \$100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums	Descending order of—		
				Average rate of premiums per \$100	Losses per \$100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums
Alabama.....	\$0.99	\$0.47	47.0	17	16	21
Alaska Territory.....	1.59	.75	47.2	1	1	20
Arizona.....	1.22	.57	46.8	3	4	22
Arkansas.....	1.18	.65	55.4	4	3	1
California.....	.81	.31	38.8	29	37	42
Colorado.....	.84	.28	32.9	25	41	49
Connecticut.....	.66	.24	36.3	42	46	44
Delaware.....	.59	.22	38.4	48	49	43
District of Columbia.....	.43	.10	24.5	51	50	50
Florida.....	1.00	.35	34.4	14	31	47
Georgia.....	.59	.51	50.9	16	8	8
Hawaii.....	.81	.07	9.2	30	51	51
Idaho.....	1.11	.60	44.8	8	10	31
Illinois.....	.67	.31	45.7	40	38	28
Indiana.....	.68	.29	42.2	39	40	38
Iowa.....	.66	.36	53.6	41	30	3
Kansas.....	.72	.37	50.8	36	29	9
Kentucky.....	.79	.39	49.7	32	24	14
Louisiana.....	.90	.42	46.5	24	20	25
Maine.....	1.02	.51	50.2	12	6	13
Maryland.....	.63	.27	42.7	46	43	36
Massachusetts.....	.73	.39	53.0	35	25	5
Michigan.....	.60	.30	50.5	47	39	11
Minnesota.....	.74	.35	46.7	34	32	23
Mississippi.....	1.37	.73	53.3	2	2	4
Missouri.....	.77	.42	53.9	33	21	2
Montana.....	1.16	.50	43.1	6	9	34
Nebraska.....	.65	.32	49.4	44	36	15
Nevada.....	1.17	.47	40.2	5	15	40
New Hampshire.....	1.11	.57	51.7	7	5	6
New Jersey.....	.66	.23	34.9	43	48	46
New Mexico.....	1.08	.44	40.6	9	19	39
New York.....	.57	.24	43.1	49	47	35
North Carolina.....	.81	.40	48.9	26	23	17
North Dakota.....	1.06	.46	43.3	10	17	33
Ohio.....	.54	.25	46.7	50	44	24
Oklahoma.....	.81	.37	46.0	27	28	19
Oregon.....	1.02	.49	48.2	11	11	19
Pennsylvania.....	.69	.24	35.0	38	45	45
Rhode Island.....	.69	.32	46.4	37	35	26
South Carolina.....	1.01	.51	50.6	13	7	10
South Dakota.....	.93	.37	39.8	22	26	41
Tennessee.....	.96	.49	51.2	19	12	7
Texas.....	.98	.48	49.2	18	13	16
Utah.....	.80	.34	42.6	31	33	37
Vermont.....	.95	.46	48.7	21	18	18
Virginia.....	.81	.37	45.6	28	27	29
Washington.....	.96	.48	50.4	20	14	12
West Virginia.....	.91	.41	44.9	23	22	30
Wisconsin.....	.63	.27	43.8	45	42	32
Wyoming.....	1.00	.33	33.4	15	34	48
Average.....	.72	.32	44.4	-----	-----	-----

Source: Record of Fire Insurance by States, published annually by the Weekly Underwriter.

## "STREAMLINING" OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "A Dominant Legislature," which appeared in the November 20, 1943, issue of the Washington Review of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

I submit this article in connection with Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which I introduced on November 9, 1943, and which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Rules.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE CONGRESS A DOMINANT LEGISLATURE

At this most critical hour in the epoch of congressional government, Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY have

come forth with a most constructive proposal to bolster and retain a government by the people. This week they introduced companion resolutions (S. Con. Res. 23 and H. Con. Res. 54) to provide for an examination into the functions, duties, and operations of the House and Senate. Out of the knowledge derived from this study and analysis, they anticipate recommendations to fortify and to equip Congress to meet the needs of a "growing society." They propose to modernize Congress to fulfill all expectations of a deliberative body, which was conceived in the theory of representative government as an institutional bulwark of government by the people.

These resolutions would establish a bipartisan joint committee composed of six Senators and six Representatives to study "the organization and operation of each House of Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationship between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the members of the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationship between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress."

Some congressional procedure has become obsolete; much of it needs altering or remodeling. The relationship between Congress and the administration has become outmoded—the administrative machinery has been under constant examination and subjected to regular change; congressional machinery has just grown up without a plan.

A good nonpartisan joint committee could do much not only to assure an improved legislature, but to effect an efficient administration through the operation of a better functioning Congress.

Representatives and Senators, however, are shy or hesitant in doing anything for themselves, thus, to aid Congress in doing this job, they need the outspoken and active support of every public-spirited citizen who can contribute suggestions and encouragement. Do not let this opportunity pass.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask permission that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Amarillo (Tex.) News of November 16, 1943, entitled "Streamliner."

This editorial also refers to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which I submitted, and which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STREAMLINER

There's mounting interest here on the subject of streamlining Congress. The drive advanced considerably this week with introduction of a joint resolution by Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut, and Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, calling for a special committee to study the subject. This marked the first time a House Member and Senator have gotten together to work for streamlining, although at least a score of bills and resolutions have been introduced by various Congressmen. The proposed Maloney-Monroney committee would recommend improved staffing of committees; and better liaison in committee structure; the need for better liaison between House and Senate committees to avoid needless duplication of work.

The growing feeling here is that Congress has failed to regain its much-espoused independence and to effect real economies in government because it simply does not have the modern machinery to attain those objectives. It lacks a staff of experts, advisers,



and investigators which confront Congress from the executive agencies. Its sprawling set-up of 80 standing committees (House and Senate together) rivals anything that bureaucracy has to offer in the way of duplication and rivalry. The congressional committee set-up has remained untouched for 50 years, whereas the executive branch was reorganized as recently as 1940 and the judiciary only a few years before. No wonder the Congress, with this oxcart organization, cannot keep abreast of the other coordinate branches of government, says the Maloney school.

**MR. MALONEY.** Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will Congress Reorganize To Meet the New Tempo?" from the Philadelphia Record of November 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**WILL CONGRESS REORGANIZE TO MEET THE NEW TEMPO?**

The streamlining of Congress to keep its processes abreast fast-moving events has been suggested many times in the last few years.

Now, two Members of Congress—Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, and Representative MONROE, of Oklahoma—propose to do something about it. They have introduced a joint resolution to create a bipartisan Senate-House commission to speed up our legislative procedures.

Under the proposed resolution, the congressional commission would prepare plans even broader. It would go into:

(a) Organization and operation of each House; (b) relationships between the two houses, now often conflicting in needless detail; (c) relationships between Congress and other branches of the Government; (d) employment and pay of personnel by Members and committees; (e) structure and relationship of the various congressional committees.

Perhaps it is too much to expect the Senate to end some of the ancient rules by which obstruction is made easy and construction difficult.

For example, the rules of senatorial courtesy; the rule by which a single objection can tie up measures for varying lengths of time; the device of the filibuster, which has been used time and again to obstruct ordinary democratic processes by preventing the Senate from voting on major measures.

Even if these long-standing stumbling blocks to action in the upper house are not removed, there is much more work that a commission such as that proposed could accomplish.

For example, there has been need of a central committee of both houses to prepare congressional programs. In this day and age it is not enough that Congress say "No! No! No!" to proposals of the Executive. If it opposes a major measure, it should be prepared to meet the emergency with constructive counter-measures.

There has been need, also, for a congressional committee to perform liaison work between the legislative branch and the Cabinet, especially with the State Department.

True, the State Department has not welcomed proposals for such closer relations. But it is not fair to assume that such opposition would continue in the face of a constructive program by which Senators, Representatives, and State Department chiefs could meet on major problems—

So that in legislating on those problems there would be no interminable debate over trivial details.

The Connally resolution is a case in point. It was debated so long that when the vote

finally came, events at Moscow had overtaken it and the resolution was hastily amended to bring it up to date.

Much of the misunderstanding on other administrative problems might be averted with closer liaison between the various executive departments and Congress. We have in mind rationing, the oil situation, the lend-lease controversy and other questions which ought not to be controversial at all in time of war.

That is why the Maloney-Monroe resolution is of vital importance to the country. That is why it should be passed by both Houses in the interests of more efficient and more democratic government.

If the commission chosen for the task of reorganization includes leaders of both parties, men with experience and influence to see the proposals through—the benefits to our representative form of government will be both immediate and enduring.

**THANKSGIVING DAY ADDRESS BY  
SENATOR WILEY**

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Thanksgiving Day address broadcast by him over stations in Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

**MY VISIT WITH THE NEIGHBORS—  
ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER**

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "My Visit With the Neighbors," delivered by Senator BUTLER on November 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

**POETIC TRIBUTE TO SENATORS BURTON,  
BALL, HILL, AND HATCH**

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senators BURTON, BALL, HILL, and HATCH, by Franklin P. Adams, which appears in the Appendix.]

**SOME PREMISES OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY  
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE RUTLEDGE**

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Some Premises of Peace," delivered by Hon. Wiley B. Rutledge, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the assembly of the American Bar Association on August 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

**FINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRTIETH  
NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION**

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD final declaration of the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention held at New York October 25-27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

**INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION—AD-  
DRESS BY NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER**

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Inter-American Cooperation Means," delivered by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, at the American Legion dinner at Washington, D. C., on November 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

**THE POLL TAX—EDITORIAL COMMENT**

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Surer Road," published in the Wilmington, Del., Journal-Every Evening of November 17, 1943, and an editorial entitled "H. R. 7," published in the Washington Post of November 20, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

**MORE THROTTLEBOTTOM ANTICS—EDI-  
TORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER**

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Throttlebottom Antics," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

**OBLIGATIONS TO MEN DISCHARGED  
FROM ARMED FORCES**

**MR. WILEY.** Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate for a brief time on a subject which I think is of real interest to the people of the country. It relates to the obligation we owe to the returning men of the armed forces. This obligation is not a monetary obligation. We cannot dismiss it with \$100 or \$200 or \$300 or even \$1,000 to the individual who comes back. These fighting men do not want subsidies; they want jobs. Ask any of the 423,616 who have been returned to civilian life in the short time between Pearl Harbor and the middle of last month, and their answer will be they want to return to jobs.

We have heard much of rehabilitating our returning soldiers, of demobilization pay, of unemployment insurance, and of what amounts virtually to a subsidy to a great army of 10,000,000 men who are shortly to be returned to civilian life after months—indeed after years, for many of them—of military regimentation.

They are thinking now, whether within the limits of continental America, in Guadalcanal, in China, in the Aleutians, in Italy, or elsewhere, and their foremost thought, their most important problem, is What will I do when I go back?

Can we by giving them \$100, \$200, or \$300 waive our obligation? If we do, again we will have a great, indeed our greatest, army of dissatisfied, disgruntled and disillusioned unemployed young men. Again we will have bonus armies or their equivalent. If we should ask any of the 423,616 young men who have been returned to civilian life between Pearl Harbor and the middle of last month what has been done to find them a normal living, a readjustment to all the concepts of civilian life from which they volunteered, or of which they were summarily deprived, their answer would be that nothing has been done.

True it is that we have assumed a moral obligation to give our servicemen their former jobs when they return. I wonder, though, should a survey be taken, how many of them would want the one they held before entering the service. How many of them at the age of 17 or 18 even had a job before leaving high school, or college, or the farm to take on their present grim task of war.

Will the farmer boy we are so proud of today, because we have given him special training, concentrated training, making him an excellent radio man, or a first-class mechanic, wish to return to the farm? No; I question whether many of them will. We have trained him for greater things; we have given him a wider vision; we have shown him other countries, new horizons, and we have



made him a highly trained specialist. No; not in every instance will that farm boy wish to return to the farm. On the reverse side, what of the underprivileged city boy whose military training has given him new visions—new visions of working with the soil, new visions of having his own farm? Will he wish to return to his former job—the routine of a gasoline station or the routine of a shipping clerk? I doubt it.

But is it our purpose to hand these boys a check, a small, temporary subsidy? For all future time we will instill in their minds the thought of pensions, bonuses, and payments on payments. Again will grow bonus armies, and from the pressure groups cries of "veteran malcontents." They will not be malcontents. They will be our neglected obligations.

Mr. President, within the Bureau established for the care of our servicemen there are many who might do something to solve this problem, but their plans and their operations are diversified. There is no cooperation. There are many who could do something, but there is no one to do it. There is no one to find jobs for our veterans. There have been messages from the Chief Executive; there have been newspaper articles; columnists have been giving their ideas; but there is no one now whose business it is to find jobs for the veterans.

A logical organization—the Veterans' Administration—is at hand. Already it deals with pension rights, insurance rights, and the hospitalization of veterans. Within a matter of weeks, even days, it can be ready to take on the tremendous task of organizing industry, commerce, and agriculture for jobs for our veterans. I repeat, 436,000 veterans have already been discharged. The Veterans' Administration knows the problems. Almost within hours it could begin the analyzing, and consulting with each individual, to ascertain where he might be most suitably placed, where he might be most valuable, and while doing that, begin the establishment of the necessary great post-war machine.

This, then, is my proposal:

First. Before his discharge from the service, prior to or after the armistice, each veteran is to submit his qualifications and desires for future employment. His questionnaire is to contain a complete dossier of his preservice and his service record. It is important that this be done while he is still under military jurisdiction and discipline.

I would stress here again the importance of having established each man's desires as to employment and locality of employment. We cannot turn these young men onto the street without some concrete objective for their future. Demobilization pay is important only if there is a definite plan as to where they are going, and what they are going to do. That plan should be executed immediately upon their discharge. If not, there will be countless numbers of unemployed veterans in every large city and community of the country, resulting in the beginning of the bread line again.

Second. Acting upon the information contained in paragraph 1 of the ques-

tionnaire to which I referred, an employment expert of the Veterans' Administration will personally consult with each of the veterans about to be discharged. Through the facilities of other organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, State and Government employment services, the United States Employment Service, and so forth, the expert will have at his disposal recorded lists of jobs and of qualifications for employment therein. After discussion with the veteran, through his experience and training, the representative of the Veterans' Administration will be in a position to determine the man's qualifications for the job best suited for him. He will know the locality to which the young man wishes to return, and why. He will not act arbitrarily, but will attempt to guide the veteran through the confusion of the readjustment period, return him to the section of the country to which he desires to go, with a definite appointment for trial to the job he wants.

Let me say, Mr. President, that there has been in contemplation—and that is what is set forth in the President's message—simply the payment on discharge of so much money. There has been in contemplation the idea that the veteran will go back to his job. I assert, and I think the statistics will bear out my statement, that more than one-third of the men who went into the armed services were never previously employed. They have no jobs. We do not want a repetition of what took place after the last World War. It is our obligation to use a little common sense in handling the problem.

To my mind, the most important phase of our program for the rehabilitation of servicemen is jobs for veterans. The organization is set up; it needs only expansion. We need only a little foresight to avoid the obvious havoc which is wrought by discharging these millions of men and women and sending them back into civilian life with a comparatively small amount of money, and an honorable record of service in the fighting forces of their country, which should be their greatest asset and the fastest, surest way of their getting jobs.

With other recommendations already made to the Congress I am in full accord. They are not matters of immediate moment; they are matters to which the veteran will naturally adjust himself on his return to normal life. They then become his problems, and ones which he will readily assume for himself after his readjustment. But return him first to a responsible job of his own choosing, with a pride in his military service and not a bitter resentment as he trudges the streets of a strange city knowing not where to turn for counsel and assistance. Insurance will not help him then.

Remember that a majority of these young men and women are untrained to the responsibilities of money. Their allotments to their families go home automatically; the money they have in their pockets does not mean food or a place to sleep. Give them their demobilization pay but do not turn them loose on the street. If that should happen, unless

help is afforded them, they lead a good life for a few days, as they do now on a 48-hour liberty, but within a week or two they will not have a camp or a ship to return to; nor will most of them have a job. The trouble that would ensue is obvious. What I have said, Mr. President, can be confirmed on the streets of any great city in the country today.

Until we have taken positive steps to counsel and advise our returning service men and women, as we would our sons and our daughters in meeting a new, confused situation, we shall not have kept faith as we promised. Until we give notice that our plans go far beyond a summary dismissal, with a pocketful of change, we will not have given notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down.

Mr. President, I say it is letting them down if, when these boys come back, they are handed \$100 or \$200 or \$300 and told "now go on your way." I say it is doing something more—it is taking the fine manhood that is there present, that has proven itself, and putting it in a position where it may undo itself.

While I am making this proposal before the Congress, I am taking further steps, as a matter of interest, to find what we might do as private citizens in furnishing not only employment but centers of rehabilitation and readjustment for our returning soldiers and sailors.

Wisconsin, as do all the other States, has many large industries which might be organized with a dual purpose:

First. Furnishing a healthy, gainful occupation for our veterans and an interim of unworried adjustment while they are returning to civilian life; and

Second. Furnishing the men with which to replace major manpower shortages for the production of materials of which we are now threatened with drastic shortages.

Wisconsin is one of the larger producers of pulpwood, pulp, and paper. Activities in these industries have been notably curtailed because of a shortage of men to harvest the pulpwood and turn it to its useful purposes at the mills.

I have written to the officers and directors of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association regarding the possibility of establishing relocation camps, which would serve this dual purpose, giving our boys an interlude—not military and not civilian—during which they would lead normal everyday lives while facing readjustment to their permanent future. I should like to read this letter and to make it a part of the RECORD. Addressed to 26 leading Wisconsin manufacturers, this is the letter:

DEAR SIR: Wisconsin has long been a leader in social reform. With this thought in mind, I appeal for your consideration of a plan submitted by me today before the Senate, supplementing what I believe to be an extremely necessary and important action in the rehabilitation of our returning war veterans. It is my thought that the important thing—the problem paramount in the minds of our young men—is returning to us assured of our help in securing immediate employment. They will have been too long removed from their daily associations to know by what manner or means to go about getting a job.



Hundreds of thousands of them have already been returned to civilian life; hundreds of thousands more will have been returned before the armistice.

It is on behalf of these young men that I ask your cooperation in furthering what has all the possibilities of being not only a humanitarian plan but one which will greatly benefit the war effort by advancing production.

Our country needs newsprint. We are faced with a drastic shortage. We have been told that it is impossible to harvest our pulpwood because of the manpower shortage. On the other hand, we have these thousands of young men returning to civilian life—goodly majority of them still strong and husky, below or near the age of 25, and without any plans or thoughts for employment in the immediate future. They face it bleakly.

Your consideration is asked of a plan to provide a State-wide chain of camps in which these boys may be employed, if they so desire, upon discharge. These are not to be rest camps. You are simply to consider yourself employing men to operate the pulpwood camps. They are to be fed, quartered, and paid just as you have paid your camp personnel in the past. The only additional facility to be provided would be that of a wider recreational nature, with also a bureau which would function in an advisory capacity in replacing these young men in permanent positions.

Undoubtedly camp sites and camps are already available, many of them already constructed, awaiting only the occupants that the manpower shortage has made it impossible to secure. I hope immediate consideration can be given to this thought, and that you will let me have your reactions on it as soon as possible.

I shall be in Wisconsin next week, and, if possible, should like to go into the matter with as many of you as might be available.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, many States have facilities available for the organization of similar location centers, such as the pulpwood industry, fishing, lumbering, farming, cattle, which would, by private enterprise, serve a great twofold purpose. Certainly it is a step in the right direction, although one we can consider only as private individuals. This, then, is the manner, as legislators and private citizens, in which I ask the Senate to take immediate action in accepting the responsibility to get jobs for our veterans. I repeat, monetary payments upon discharge will not solve this tremendous problem. They will merely mitigate it temporarily. The problems of insurance and social security are matters of importance, but are not of as immediate concern as getting the jobs.

#### WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, as amended.

#### DENIAL OF VOTE TO SERVICEMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, while the Senate has under consideration the

soldier-vote bill, I regard it as a sacred duty to invite attention to the fact, which might otherwise be overlooked, that this bill and the fine sentiment back of it lack consistency in at least one respect. No matter in what form this legislation shall finally emerge from Congress, the fighting men from an important community in our country—the District of Columbia—will not be among the beneficiaries. They will continue to be denied the right and privilege of voting in a national election, a right the exercise of which patriotic orators tell us goes hand in hand with arms-bearing.

Fighting side by side over there with the men from your State and mine, Mr. President, are the fighting men from the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia, a total of about 70,000. They are the men who volunteered or were drafted, just like the boys from your State and mine. They are in the thick of the fight in all theaters of the war. They are shedding their blood and giving their all for their country and its democratic institutions, in which they do not fully share.

One of the most cherished of these institutions is the right to participate in the government of their country through the exercise of the elective franchise. This is a fundamental right which we now appear so anxious to preserve and assure to all in the armed forces. It is recognized as an established principle of democracy that arms bearing in the country's service and participation in government through the ballot box go together naturally.

Mr. President, if we truly believe in this self-evident principle, why do we not busy ourselves and see to it that the privilege of the vote in national elections is extended to those who fight, who bleed, and who die in the country's service, whose only offense, if any, is that their home is located in the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia?

Of course, I know that such a reasonable and fully justified provision, to cover the fighting men from the District of Columbia, cannot be carried in the pending bill because of constitutional limitations; but I do know that it would be an act of justice, and consistent with our professed devotion to fundamental American fair play, to give prompt and favorable consideration to Senate Joint Resolution 33, which proposes to add to the Constitution of the United States the following amendment introduced by me in the Senate, and by Representative SUMNERS of Texas in the House of Representatives:

The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

From the local press I have culled interesting matter bearing very pertinently upon this question, and shall quote briefly from some of it. All of it shows that the prime reason for the pending sol-

dier-vote legislation is the belief of Members of Congress and others that all the men who fight for their country should have the franchise.

The Washington Times-Herald, under date of September 10, 1942, quoted Representative DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, as saying:

If a young man is willing to lay down his life in Russia, Iceland, Africa, Australia, and other parts of the world, he should have the franchise.

This article further stated that activating the great majority of the Members was the theme:

Anyone willing to sacrifice his life in the country's defense has a right to vote.

The Washington Star of October 22, 1943, quoted Secretary of the Navy KNOX as believing that—

Every man in uniform or out of uniform should be given a chance to vote.

The Washington Post of November 16, 1943, stated that in a radio speech the preceding night the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee, outlined provisions of the bill and urged that it be treated as a war measure. The Senator from Rhode Island was quoted directly as saying:

It is not fair that these men, who are ready to give their last full measure of devotion, should, because of that fact, be prevented from enjoying the most fundamental right of a free man in a democratic country, the right to vote.

I should like also to incorporate in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Star of Thursday, August 27, 1942, entitled "Bearing Arms and Voting," and another editorial from the Star of Saturday, October 30, 1943, under the heading "Talk and Double Talk." Both of these are very pertinent in amplification of what I have been attempting to make clear to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 27, 1942]

#### BEARING ARMS AND VOTING

Regardless of the fate of amendments waiving poll tax payments and other conditions of voting in the States, Senate action Tuesday in sending the so-called soldier vote bill to conference is intended to assure men and women in the service, no matter where they are stationed throughout the world, that they will be able to vote in national elections.

This exercise of their privilege as American citizens is in accord with the high principles they are defending in uniform, and is altogether appropriate. But what a contrast it offers between the rights of Americans who live in the States and those who live in the District of Columbia!

Men and women from Washington are serving in and out of uniform wherever Americans are serving in this war. The statistics on volunteers are for the present a military secret. But Washingtonians have filled their draft quotas in selective service and if history repeats they will exceed their quotas as volunteers.

To preserve the Union in the War between the States the first volunteers came from Washington, and Washingtonians supplied a greater percentage of troops in excess of

quota than almost any State of the Union. In the War with Spain Washington sent a fine regiment to Cuba, exceeding its quota in numbers. And in the First World War the total volunteers from the District exceeded the number of volunteers from eight of the States combined. Only five of the States exceeded, in ratio of volunteers to total enlistments, the World War record established by the District of Columbia.

Men and women from all the States now serving in the armed forces took part, in theory, in the enactment of laws which governed their service. They are citizens in a government which directly couples the right of representation with the duty of bearing arms in time of war. But for the Washingtonian, the highest privilege of the citizen—casting his vote—is denied; the highest duty of a citizen—to bear arms in defense of his country—is demanded in full and is loyally given.

There is ugly irony in the fact that when men and women in the armed services are called upon to vote next November the only ones forbidden to respond will be those whose homes are in the Capital of the United States, the Nation which has assumed the major role in preserving democratic principles of government in the world to come.

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1943]

#### TALK AND DOUBLE TALK

A subcommittee of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee is working to perfect machinery for getting out the soldier vote next year. The device is the Green-Lucas bill, which cuts through registration and poll-tax requirements and simplifies the ballot to the point where the soldier could vote the national ticket merely by indicating his preference for "Democrat" or "Republican." A war ballot commission would draw up the rules and supervise the details.

Of the proposal Senator GREEN says: "Servicemen now constitute such a large part of the electorate that any national election in which they did not participate could hardly be called representative."

Few will quarrel with the general objectives of the legislation. Arms-bearing and the right to vote are inseparably coupled in the tradition of America.

Approval of the bill, nevertheless, would be another slurring act of discrimination against the loyal and patriotic Washingtonians now in the service and who are barred from voting because of the accident of their residence in the Capital of the United States.

Exact figures on the number of Washington men in the service is restricted information, but it is permissible to use 60,000 as an approximation in round numbers. These men, found in every branch of the service on every front in the world, are in every sense good Americans. They are making the same sacrifice that other Americans are making to preserve the principle that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." By every tenet of democratic government they have a valid claim to a voice in the government that sends them to war. To ignore that claim is in itself a repudiation of the very things they are asked to die for.

Yet, when the men in the service are told to vote as a patriotic duty, these 60,000 will be shunted aside, treated in this respect as convicted deserters or convicts, or lunatics. All this because they are residents of the Nation's Capital.

That is why a lot of the talk about the Nation's obligation to the soldier, in making it easy for him to vote in 1944, sounds like double talk to the people who live in Washington.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, war or no war, the people who are permanent residents of the District of Columbia

are entitled to recognition as full-fledged Americans with voting participation in the government of their country. They are the peers of any people throughout the length and breadth of the United States. They are second to none in their patriotic devotion to their country, in their education and knowledge, and in their general qualifications to exercise the rights and privileges of American citizens.

While the men in the armed forces from the States might lose the national voting privilege in a single election, it should be remembered that the people of this District have been denied the privilege in each national election for 143 years. The hearts of statesmen bleed for the servicemen who might through their service be denied the vote in a single election, but there is little or no bleeding for their fellow Americans who are and have always been denied the vote in every national election since the seat of the Government was located here.

Mr. President, these people are the equals of the best among those in the States whose votes sent us here to Congress.

By intimate association with these people during the past 25 years, I consider myself fully competent to testify to their fine, patriotic, and public-spirited qualities. To me it has always been a source of mortification and shame to reflect that in actual practice these fine Americans are, politically, only the subjects of the United States, and by no means the political equals of the citizens of the States. I must qualify this statement, however, by admitting that the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia are the equals of the citizens of the States in possessing the duty, right, and privilege of bearing all the burdens of American citizenship, which fall alike upon all citizens of the Republic.

I appeal to all other Members of the Senate, Mr. President, to join with me in a movement to strike off the political bonds of these our fellow Americans of the District of Columbia, and to make it possible for them to be recognized as citizens in fact. Then we shall have clean hands, and may consistently spread the doctrine of democracy in other lands throughout the world.

Mr. President, I can see no reason, based on fundamental American grounds, for longer delaying favorable action on the proposed constitutional amendment which I have quoted. It would clothe Congress with the requisite power to give these good citizens of the Nation's Capital the American right and privilege of participating, through their duly elected representatives in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President, in the Government of their country. They need, as citizens of the Republic, to participate in both the legislative and the executive branches of their Government.

While this, of course, cannot be done in time to give District men now in the armed forces the right of participation in the next national election, it would prepare the way. Then the Congress and the States, having granted this gra-

cious act of long-delayed justice, we would be ready on another occasion, if again visited by the misfortune of war, to treat the soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard men from the District of Columbia precisely, Mr. President, as we would treat those who went into the service from your State and mine. If we believe that the peoples of all the nations of the world should enjoy the same privileges and rights as their fellows in their nations, why is that not a good principle to follow in its application to our fellow Americans of the District of Columbia?

#### WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I submitted earlier in the day, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 2, in the committee amendment, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Such commissioners shall be appointed from lists of not less than six nominees submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties. Vacancies in the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments, that is, from lists of not less than three nominees for each such vacancy submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to speak on his amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Eastland	Maloney
Andrews	Ellender	Maybank
Austin	George	Mead
Bankhead	Gillette	Millikin
Barkley	Green	Moore
Bilbo	Hatch	Murray
Bone	Hawkes	Nye
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hill	O'Mahoney
Burton	Holman	Overton
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Byrd	Kilgore	Reed
Capper	Langer	Revercomb
Caraway	Lodge	Reynolds
Chavez	Lucas	Robertson
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Scruggam
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Shipstead
Danaher	McFarland	Smith
Davis	McKellar	Stewart



Thomas, Idaho	Tydings	Wheeler
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wherry
Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys	White
Tobey	Wagner	Wiley
Truman	Wallgren	Willis
Tunnell	Walsh	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on public business today and will be so absent tomorrow. I wish this announcement to stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the principle of the bill now under consideration, Senate bill 1285. Like all other Members of this body, I have a direct personal interest in the welfare of the men and women who are serving us in the armed forces. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who has not given considerable thought and study to the ways and means by which the men and women in the armed services may vote next November. There is no Member of the Senate who does not wish to make that possible if it can be done without destroying the sanctity of the vote, and if, in trying to make such a vote possible, we do not pave the way for fraud or manipulation of the freedom of the ballot, which, in my judgment, is the greatest of our institutions in America. We must at all times maintain the faith of our people in the processes of free elections.

Mr. President, once before in America there was ill feeling throughout the country because of the outcome of a contested Presidential election. To this day there is the feeling—and I think historians will so record—that perhaps Tilden instead of Hayes was morally entitled to the Presidency in 1876. At that time we were threatened with another civil war. Tilden had received 184 uncon-

tested electoral votes, and Hayes had received 163. Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina, with a total of 22 electoral votes, each sent in 2 sets of electoral ballots. In Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina 1 set gave the whole vote to Tilden, and the other set gave it entirely to Hayes. One set from Oregon gave the State's 3 votes to Hayes. Another set gave 2 votes for Hayes and 1 to Tilden. Hayes had to receive all 22 votes in order to win.

In that year the House was controlled by the Democrats, and the Senate was controlled by the Republicans. Many constitutional questions immediately arose as to whether Congress could go behind the State certification—questions similar to those which we may now encounter. Feeling in the Nation was running so high, and the impossibility of the Senate and House reaching an agreement was so apparent, that an electoral commission was created, composed of five Members from each political party in Congress, two of each party from the Supreme Court, and another man was selected, Justice Joseph P. Bradley, a Republican, but he was not selected as a partisan.

We all know the result. On the face of the popular vote Hayes had carried South Carolina and Oregon, and Tilden had carried Florida and Louisiana. By a vote of 8 Republicans to 7 Democrats, Florida and Louisiana were given to Hayes. The commission unanimously gave him South Carolina and Oregon. In Louisiana the 8 Republicans on the commission, not only rejected the Democratic set of electoral votes, but, in the matter of the Republican set, refused to go behind the certification of a Republican board which had ruled out several thousand Democratic votes.

I cite this experience, Mr. President, by way of warning that the country may not stand any lack of confidence in the conduct of our 1944 elections. At a time of great crisis when feeling is running high amongst our people, at a time when we are living under the strain of a global war, we must make sure that there will be no question as to who is elected President in November 1944 or elected to the Senate and to the House in 1944. We must make sure that the outcome does not lend itself to legal quibbling, to legal technicalities. Under no circumstances must the people get the impression, rightly or wrongly, that their choice for President, for Senator, or for their Representative, has been denied them. There is too much suspicion already abroad in our land, Mr. President, and I cannot think of anything which would crystallize it so quickly as the circumstances which might develop from the proposed act in its present language.

Mr. President, any bill which is passed by the Senate with my vote must have very definite safeguards against the young men and women of our armed forces being intimidated to vote for their Commander in Chief. By "intimidation" I mean physical intimidation, or intimidation by propaganda spread by the O. W. I., or any other agency. We must be convinced that they who are

giving so freely of their lives, will not be herded to the polls, so to speak, in the manner used by Boss Hague or Boss Kelly. We want to be convinced, too, that the young men of the merchant marine are not to be dominated or browbeaten by their Communist union boss under whom the United States Government has placed them, and who are now being deferred from the draft by order of the high command in Washington.

I have recently sent to the desk an amendment to the pending bill. It would change the manner in which the bill would set up the ballot commission. It provides that the respective national committees shall submit not less than six nominees from whom two shall be selected to serve. In the case of a vacancy, it must be filled from not less than three nominees designated by the respective committees.

I think it is vital to maintain the integrity of this commission. It is no reflection on the present President of the United States. But if he should happen to be a candidate for re-election, I wish to safeguard the appointments to the proposed ballot law commission in such a way that the people of the country will have confidence in the integrity of the commission. Under the pending proposal there is nothing to prevent any President of the United States from appointing some Republicans—we have some in this country, who unfortunately have pink tendencies, New Deal tendencies, and some of whom are under obligation to the administration. I am not saying that the President would appoint them, but it would be possible for him to do so. So I think it is wise, fair, and proper at this time to safeguard the appointments. It is our duty to do this.

Mr. President, the other day it was stated by Members of the Senate on the floor—I think by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] that this would be a reflection on the President of the United States. We have established previous precedents in past years which the Presidents then in office did not consider to be a reflection upon them. We have passed good laws which have been enforced, and no other President has been insulted or offended by them.

If I were President Roosevelt and I had in my mind even the slightest thought that I should be a candidate for reelection for a fourth term, I would say to the American Congress, "If you want to establish a United States ballot law commission, set up all the safeguards you can, and by all means have the nominees from whom I shall appoint members of the commission nominated by the respective political parties." That would bring integrity and character to the commission. It would breed confidence throughout the country in the commission. That is what I am trying to do.

In order to show that we have actual examples or precedents for this proposal, I invite attention to two very definite acts. I refer to the Transportation Act

of 1920. Section 304 of the act states as follows:

There is hereby established a board to be known as the Railroad Labor Board and to be composed of nine members, as follows:

1. Three members constituting the labor group, representing the employees and subordinate officials of the carriers, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from not less than six nominees whose nominations shall be made and offered by such employees in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe;

2. Three members, constituting the management group, representing the carriers, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from not less than six nominees whose nominations shall be made and offered by the carriers in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe; and

3. Three members, constituting the public group, representing the public, to be appointed directly by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

We also had a Commission known as the National Screw Thread Commission which was established under an act passed in 1926. I quote from that act as follows:

That a Commission is hereby created, to be known as the Commission for the Standardization of Screw Threads, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, which shall be composed of nine commissioners, one of whom shall be the Director of the Bureau of Standards, who shall be Chairman of the Commission; two representatives of the Army, to be appointed by the Secretary of War; two representatives of the Navy, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and four to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce; two of whom shall be chosen from nominations made by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and two from nominations made by the Society of Automotive Engineers.

In other words, in many instances we have established the precedent of selecting from a list of nominees from which the President of the United States could make his choice. Under the presently proposed act, we are not saying to the President of the United States, "You must appoint John Jones and Bill Smith, two Republicans." We are offering him a list of six names, all of whom would be outstanding, reputable citizens in whom the respective party organizations would have confidence. We say to the President, "We are offering you this list. Now, Mr. President, take your choice, but appoint the Republicans from a list of regular Republican men and women in whom we will have confidence. This is not any reflection on you, Mr. President, but we do not want to take a chance, if I may say so, of having appointed Republicans of questionable party regularity or standing."

We are not attempting to interfere with the principle of this bill, but we are trying to set up definite safeguards so that the country will have confidence in the act and its administration.

One suggestion regarding the bill which some people are advancing, and which we frequently hear expressed, is that the parents of this country cannot be trusted to vote the welfare of their loved ones in the armed forces. This argument springs from the Communists,

Mr. President, and it has been unwittingly accepted by many people who do not recognize its implications.

It is a part of an insidious campaign which has been going on in this country for several years—a campaign to split up the family unit. We have heard all too much in recent years to the effect that the parents of the past two generations have sold their children down the river and have fallen down on them. Some parents may have done so; some of them may be neglecting their children. Probably, however, it is not because of their own desire but because of some necessity or because of work in essential industries in this critical time. As a whole, parents think just as much of their children today as they ever did.

Today there are some 9,000,000 empty seats at the breakfast tables of this country, made vacant by the sons and daughters and husbands who are in the armed services and whose vacant chairs bear testimony to the fact of the family interest in loved ones overseas. Senators who may have read the editorial comment on the inside cover page of This Week magazine in the Sunday supplement yesterday noted the story of a great moving-picture actress, Greer Garson, who was aiding in the sale of bonds and who went to the State of West Virginia to tell the people there that they should get behind the bond drive. She wondered when she went through sections of West Virginia whether the people there were aware that the Nation was fighting a war; but when she went into the mining towns and saw literally hundreds and thousands of people marching by, one group representing 600 mothers, all proudly displaying their service buttons of sons and daughters in the service, she realized that the people of this country do know that there is a war going on, that they very definitely have an interest in the men and the women in the armed services, and they want them equitably and fairly treated, and in turn intend to carry on at home.

Mr. President, if any one thing can be called the cornerstone of representative government it is the free and untrammelled right of the people to choose their own officials in elections honestly conducted, for if elections are not free, then the Constitution itself is endangered.

There is not a Member of the Senate who does not believe that men who are offering their lives on the altar of freedom should have the right to participate in next year's elections when a new President of the United States will be elected. On the other hand, I am equally sure that there is not one among my colleagues who does not feel with me that it would be a cruel joke upon these men if in enacting legislation we did not do all within our power to insure that their votes will be treated in the same secret manner as are votes on the home front.

Now what are the provisions governing voting at the polls in the United States? They provide that elections shall be conducted in a bipartisan manner, with representatives of both major parties participating equally in preparing the machinery, in guarding the polls,

and in counting the ballots. Stringent penalties, including jail sentences, are provided for tampering with an election.

Obviously this is impossible on the far-flung battlefields of the world where our boys are today fighting. In such circumstances there cannot possibly be this bipartisan operation. So we have the alternative of setting up the machinery in such a way that the commissioned officers of the Army and the Navy, in whom the Nation has the utmost faith, shall carry on the elections under the direction of a ballot commission.

In examining this proposed legislation, however, I find some strange words; I note language that is new to any election laws I have ever seen in this country.

At the very end of title 1 of this bill I find a section with the unusual caption, "Act to be liberally construed"; and then, under the caption I find the following words, unbelievable as it may seem:

No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally.

Then follow the words, "substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient."

Mr. President, what do those words mean?

What is a liberal interpretation of an act of Congress, unless it means such liberties as New Deal executive agencies have taken with congressional acts in recent years under the pretext of Executive orders?

What is substantial compliance with an act of Congress?

Mr. President, this section of this proposed legislation standing by itself leaves the way open to invalidate any restrictions that Congress might write into this law to insure honest voting.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire, I understand, is referring to the words "substantial compliance" as found on page 32 of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Subsection (c) on page 32 in section 114, as I recall, is the only place where the words "substantial compliance" occur, and they have been eliminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. If they have been eliminated by the Vandenberg amendment, then my remarks at that point are not in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I was not certain the Senator was present when section (c) was stricken from the bill, I think, a week ago today.

Mr. BRIDGES. On page 34, in section 119, the Senator from Illinois will find that the words "shall be construed liberally" and the words "substantial compliance" still remain in section 119. I do not believe those words at that point were eliminated by the Vandenberg amendment.



Mr. VANDENBERG. They were not.

Mr. BRIDGES. So my remarks would be pertinent to the bill as reported by the committee at that point.

I think it would be very unwise and unfair if we should pass a bill on this subject and leave it to some who are known to be political leaders in this country to interpret liberally or in a substantial way in compliance with the law its indefinite and intangible phrases. I think these things should be cleared up insofar as possible.

Mr. President, through Federal machinery or through the use of State election machinery it is our intention to make provision that the soldiers and sailors shall have a vote in the coming elections.

But, whatever our course may be, let us take out the loopholes that permit any fraud in connection with the voting; let us provide stiff penalties for any violation of the provisions we enact; let us guard against political propaganda being sneaked to our sons and daughters who are in uniform.

We have looked abroad, Mr. President, and seen one free people after another collapse into ruinous dictatorship because the right to free election of their own officials was stolen from them. We have looked at foreign lands and seen their youth propagandized until their very souls were permeated with the doctrines of their Fuehrers. We have seen them herded into polling booths to vote "Ja" virtually on penalty of death.

Free elections, I repeat, are the cornerstone of the Republic; and free elections cannot be conducted with the candidate for office naming his own voting commissioners, or with such voting commissioners instructed to give substantial compliance or liberal constructions to the laws which Congress enacts on the subject. Free elections are sacred, and must be safeguarded.

I think it is fair to say that the attitude which I represent here, which is expressed by many Senators on this side of the Chamber, is to the effect that we do not wish to interfere with the right of the soldiers, sailors, and marines, the men and women in the armed forces, to vote in the coming election, or to act at cross purposes in any way. We want the law to be so airtight, the supervising facility, which is to be the United States ballot law commission, so set up, that the American public will have confidence in the men and women selected as members of the commission and in their acts.

The only way by which all doubt can be removed is to have nominations by the respective political parties. I cannot see why the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island cannot accept the amendment, because they know, as well as I do, that it is a way to write into law a guaranty of the character and integrity of the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the able Senator from New Hampshire that free and honest elections are the cornerstones of a successful Republican form of government. I yield to no

Senator in my desire to throw every safeguard around the measure which has been proposed which will make it absolutely certain that in the end the soldier, sailor, or marine will have an opportunity to vote, regardless of where he is serving. I agree that the vote must be secret, and that his ballot ultimately be cast in the precinct where the voter resides.

I am against the proposed amendment, and made a short argument in opposition to it when the bill was being discussed last week. In view of the language creating the ballot commission, I see no reason why the amendment should be placed in the bill.

The ballot commission would have no function of making decisions. We have attempted from the beginning to keep the ballot commission from having other than ministerial or administrative duties, and when last week we agreed to strike from the bill paragraph (c) of section 114, we stripped the ballot commission of all power, insofar as it would have any decision of consequence to make.

Notwithstanding that, listening to the able Senator from New Hampshire would give one the impression that the ballot commission would be the instrumentality under which another Tilden-Hayes case might arise in the event of a close election. I undertake to say that by the wildest stretch of the imagination one could not read anything like that into the language which is proposed to set up the ballot commission. The only thing the ballot commission could do would be to take the reports submitted by the secretaries of state of the States and the officials in the various election precincts, and if the ballot commission should ascertain from analyzing those reports that something was wrong in connection with the counting of the votes, then the irregularity would be reported to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress then could do what it saw fit in that situation.

Last week I agreed with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in connection with the formation of the commission. I undertake to say that, had we desired to have upon the ballot commission three Democrats and two Republicans, as the provision was originally written, we probably could have done it. That is usually the way boards are set up in every State. If the Governor is a Republican, and he creates a board of five individuals, he appoints three Republicans and two Democrats. That is the tradition of this country; it is traditional in the case of the Federal Government and of State governments. It is the American way of doing things. The party in power always has the majority on every board. Notwithstanding that, however, we yielded so far as to provide for the appointment of only two men from the Democratic Party and two from the Republican Party, and then, in case of a dispute, the majority must rule. How much further does the Senator want us to go?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Up to now the Senator has been very fair in his approach on the bill, and I think he showed excellent judgment and outstanding fairness in accepting the so-called Vandenberg amendment the last day the bill was under consideration, and we have today a much better and fairer bill than the bill as originally introduced. Why cannot the Senator from Illinois, who is a distinguished Senator, who says he wants to be very fair, and who I believe does wish to be fair, go all the way, so that there cannot be any question in the mind of anyone relative to the integrity of the commission?

Mr. LUCAS. I agree that there can be no question about the integrity of the commission. As it is proposed to be set up there will be no question. This is much ado about nothing. That is why I am on my feet objecting to the amendment. The implications of the amendment are such that I say, considerably and advisedly, that its adoption would be a reflection upon the President of the United States, especially at this time, and particularly in view of the fact that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army. I for one am not going to say to him that I do not trust the President of the United States to nominate two Republicans and two Democrats who will be acceptable to the Senate. I have no doubt that the President of the United States will do exactly what the Senator seeks to have done by his amendment, but I do not intend to thrust that in his face and say, "You must do this—or else."

I went so far as to say on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, and I repeat, that in the event the President of the United States should send to us names of men who were not satisfactory to either the majority or minority leaders, I would vote not to confirm. That is how fair I want to be. But I do not think the enactment of such a proposal would be right, I do not think it would be fair, and I question the propriety of having an amendment such as this thrust upon the President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think it is any worse to adopt an amendment such as the one I have suggested, restricting the group from which the President shall appoint under the proposed law, than for Congress to have placed restrictions on other Presidents?

Mr. LUCAS. I heard the Senator read about the different boards which have been appointed, but each and every one of those boards had power to make decisions which affected the social, the economic, or the political life of the Nation.

What I am objecting to is the placing of the war ballot commission in the same category with persons who have something to do. Its members would be mere administrative clerks.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.



Mr. BRIDGES. They would not be mere clerks. The Senator would not designate as mere clerks a group of men and women who are going to supervise the voting of 10,000,000 men and women in a great national election, would he?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not understand the bill if he takes the position that the ballot commission is going to supervise the election.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is going to supervise these men and women voters, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. There is not a chance of that. The Army and the Navy have all the responsibility for the supervision and control and conduct of the election. The only thing the ballot commission does under the bill is to prepare the ballot, prepare the instructions, and then pass the ballot on to the Army and the Navy, who assume all the responsibility for getting the ballot to the soldier, having it voted, having it returned to the ballot commission, and then when the vote is returned to the ballot commission it is transferred to a secretary of state. That is all the commission has to do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under the measure setting up the ballot commission, are we not going to have some check on what goes to the soldiers in the way of propaganda and so on?

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean so far as magazines and literature and things of that kind are concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. Anything that pertains to a campaign, anything of a political nature.

Mr. LUCAS. There is nothing in the bill that gives the ballot commission the right to send any political materials, any propaganda, or any arguments of any kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but who is going to supervise it? Who is going to stop it in this country if it goes out?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not desire to go into that phase of the question because that comes under the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I have a long argument in my brief case which I shall make when the time comes to consider that amendment. I do not desire to be diverted now.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator going to oppose the Taft amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly am.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that the reasons are contained in an hour and a half argument. I do not wish to discuss that subject now, because we are not considering the Taft amendment. I wish first to dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. When I get through discussing the Taft amendment I think the Senator from New Hampshire will be opposed to it. When the Senator from Ohio really understands the implications contained in his amendment he will withdraw his amendment in its present form.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have great admiration for the Senator from Illinois, but I will say to him that if he convinces me to the point where I shall

be against the Taft amendment he will have done a good job indeed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will go along with the Senator from Ohio in the event he withdraws his amendment and presents something different, I take it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I shall agree in advance to go along with the Senator from Ohio in anything, but in general I approve of his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not say that the Senator from Ohio is going to withdraw his amendment, but the Taft amendment presents quite a serious situation. It is not from a political standpoint I am speaking; I am speaking from the standpoint of the morale of the soldier.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. On page 18, in subsection (c) I read:

(c) It shall be the duty of the commission, acting so far as practicable in consultation with representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the other agencies and officials charged with the performance of duties under this act, to formulate such plans, make such arrangements, and adopt such measures not inconsistent with the purposes of this act as it may deem appropriate to further the purposes of this act and facilitate its administration. The commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act—

Mr. LUCAS. That language is out. We agreed to strike it out last week.

Mr. BRIDGES. The whole of what I have been reading is stricken out?

Mr. LUCAS. No. The language "The commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct," and so forth—that is stricken out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Down to that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; that is stricken.

Mr. BRIDGES. That language does not make it appear as though everything has been turned over to the War Department and Navy Department. It looks as if the commission is called upon to consult the departments.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the ballot commission has to consult with the War Department and the Navy Department if it is going to do the kind of job that everyone wants done, because on the shoulders of the Army and the Navy falls the responsibility for the administration of the act. We have told the ballot commission in the bill that they must consult with the Army and the Navy in order to ascertain what their plans are, and then the commission can proceed and perfect its plans in line with what they can do to make the act effective. That is all there is to that. It cannot be very serious.

Mr. President, I do not wish to say anything more about this particular amendment, except to suggest that there has been much misunderstanding with respect to the ballot commission. The commission has no worth-while power whatsoever. It is purely administrative. The commission makes no serious decision whatsoever, and we should not thrust this proposal into the face of the

President of the United States and say to him that he must take someone whom we are going to recommend.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the commission has so little power and is so insignificant in its power, as the Senator suggests, what can be the harm of my amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Because the Senator is attempting to do something with the ballot commission that he should not do. We have already gone all the way, I will say to the Senator, in connection with the appointment of the members of the ballot commission. The recognition we gave to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other day ought to have been sufficient and should have satisfied everyone. I do not know why the Senator is so skeptical about this commission. In other words, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that by all the rules of the game there should be three Democrats on this commission and two Republicans, and the Senator must admit that, because when he was Governor of New Hampshire he never appointed two Republicans and two Democrats on committees of which there must be a majority in order to make a decision.

Mr. BRIDGES. As Governor of New Hampshire, if I were running for a second or a third or a fourth term I certainly, if I wanted the confidence of the people of my State, would never have tried to pack the ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is in effect making a statement which he cannot support at all and he should not make it. He is too good a Senator to say that somebody is trying to pack the commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a minute, I do not yield now. The Senator should not make such a statement, because we retain in the Senate the right to confirm and approve any nomination the President of the United States may send here, and I will guarantee that there are enough Senators on this side of the aisle to take care of the situation in the event the minority leader and those on the other side who are in charge of the Republican Party do not agree with what the President does. I think I have been more than fair in attempting to meet what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle seem to think is something very serious in connection with the duties of the ballot commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator rather inferred that I had implied at least that the President of the United States intended to pack the ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what I intended to infer.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not intend to imply that at all. I said that he could pack the commission under the original set-up, or under a set-up of that kind, and that we should not allow that to be



done. Of course, if the country is to have confidence we should so limit the appointing power and so limit the set-up so there is no possibility of such a thing. Without casting any implications on the President, or anything of the kind, I still recognize that he is the most astute political character we have ever had in the White House. He does not miss many political bets.

Mr. LUCAS. On behalf of the President, I thank the Senator for that compliment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Illinois made the statement a moment ago that he felt that we were perhaps doing an unusual thing in asking for an equal representation by the two parties on the commission rather than an unequal one. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the precedent set at least in the State of Ohio wherein a similar matter affecting commissions controlling elections it is provided by statute that the respective committees of the respective parties shall each appoint an equal number on such commissions, and the commissions are made up for all elections by equal representatives of the two parties.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the veto power?

Mr. BURTON. When they reach a tie, the question is finally determined by the secretary of state, whoever he may be.

Mr. LUCAS. That is to say, the secretary of state would have the veto power.

Mr. BURTON. He finally would have the deciding vote, if they were unable to reach an agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Primarily, in all such commissions there is someone who has the power of decision, the power to break a tie. Under the amendment, we would do the unusual by saying that it would take three to break a tie, when there would be only four members of the commission.

With all due respect to my colleagues, I say we have gone more than sled's length in attempting to be fair in connection with the proposed ballot commission, and I think we would be doing an unfair thing to follow through now with a proposition of this kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure the Senator recalls that in 1937 there was quite a controversy in the country over what was known as the court-packing scheme.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I have heard about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. At that time the President of the United States attempted—I do not know whether it should be said that he attempted to pack the Supreme Court, but he certainly attempted to change the character of the Supreme Court by additional appointments—a process which was commonly known as "packing," and which I call "packing."

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. With that as a background, a great many persons would have some question in their minds,

whether rightly or wrongly, about the character of the war ballot commission, unless Congress placed some restrictions on the appointive power under the bill. For that reason I say that the President should be the first to say, "Of course I want to appoint from nominees satisfactory to the respective national committees. Of course I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think the President of the United States attempted to pack the Supreme Court. I was just as much opposed to the President's position at that time as was the Senator from New Hampshire. In those days I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I made a speech in the House against the President's proposal. Notwithstanding that, I still believe the President will appoint the kind of commission which would be satisfactory to the Senate. I do not desire to take the responsibility of saying to him, "You must appoint four from a group of certain persons to the war ballot commission," a commission which would have little or no power to make any important decision which would affect the election one way or the other. That is what I cannot understand. In other words, the members of the war ballot commission would not open the ballots. All they would do would be to prepare them. They would have nothing to do with conducting the election. They would have nothing to do with certifying to the taking of the soldier's oath.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. After the soldiers and sailors vote, and the ballots come back, to whom would they be sent first?

Mr. LUCAS. The ballots would be sent from every camp to the war ballot commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The war ballot commission immediately would segregate the ballots by States, and would send them to the respective secretaries of state. That is all the members of the war ballot commission would do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but for the time being the war ballot commission would have in its possession sufficient ballots to determine the Presidency of the United States; would it not?

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. BRIDGES. Just what I have said.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have to elaborate; I do not quite follow him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I mean that the war ballot commission might have several million ballots passing through its hands.

Mr. LUCAS. It will have; certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Therefore, we want the war ballot commission to be of such character and integrity that no one will question the several million ballots passing through its hands—ballots which might determine the outcome of the election.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no question about that. However, all that the mem-

bers of the commission would do would be to make sure that the respective secretaries of state had them in their hands, and that finally the election officials had them in their hands.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Little by little we are finding that the war ballot commission will have more and more duties on its hands.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I realize that; but the duties it will have will be unimportant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has suggested that the war ballot commission would not have much power. I notice that it would have the power to set the balloting day for our soldiers at the battle fronts.

Mr. LUCAS. No; that would be done by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the language appearing at the bottom of page 27 and at the top of page 28:

The appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

1. To designate a balloting day for voting in general elections which shall be, whenever possible, after he has received a list of candidates from all States, but which shall not be later than the date which the commission may fix for the area in which his command is located.

That is a rather important power.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true, of course. The war ballot commission would be in a better position than anyone else would be to know how long it would take to have the ballots returned from one particular area or another particular area and how long it would take to transfer the ballots from the war ballot commission to the secretaries of state. The man who is in the field in north Africa is not going to know, and is not going to take the time to ascertain, how long it will take to get the ballots back.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that the man who has the power to set the balloting day, to set the latest date on which the balloting could be held, has the power even to interfere with military operations.

Mr. LUCAS. No; he would not. There is no one who would have the power to interfere with military operations, regardless of what the bill says.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest further to the Senator that whoever can set the balloting day could change the whole course of the election; that the particular date set might mean the difference between the victory of one party or the victory of another party in the election.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator can take that position if he desires to do so. The matter of determining the date is one which must be decided by three members of the war ballot commission. I do not know of a much greater safeguard which we could throw around it.



Mr. MILLIKIN. I was merely suggesting that the matters I have developed are highly important, it seems to me, and put enormous powers in the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator about the enormity of the powers which would be in the hands of the war ballot commission. Certainly the Senator would not suggest that the Army and the Navy fix the date; would he?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I think that is one of the weaknesses of the bill. It certainly is untraditional to be turning our electoral processes over to the military.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The alternative is to turn them over to civilians, but civilians may not be able to reconcile their election plans to the war effort. There is a dilemma there which is a difficult one, whichever way one turns.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that the bill is not traditional; but never before in the history of this country have we had soldiers fighting all over the world at a time when we had a general election. However, when these emergencies arise we have to meet the conditions as they exist; and I undertake to say that the long arm of Uncle Sam, in this great emergency, cannot take a boy from Illinois or Colorado and send him to Guadalcanal or into Africa or to some other spot in the world where our boys are fighting the battle for freedom, without having the same Congress which is responsible for passing the Selective Service Act see to it that something is done under the Constitution to give that boy the right to vote. In other words, we cannot take away his political rights, in my humble opinion, when he is fighting for political rights and is willing to give his life for them, if need be.

I understand how difficult it is to draft a bill of any kind which would permit our fighting boys to vote when they are far away from home; but it should be done. It must be done. In my humble opinion we cannot take a chance on disfranchising 6,000,000 men in the most important election this country has held since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of disfranchising 6,000,000 men. Under the terms of the pending bill political rights, the right to vote, would be given to men who have never had the right of franchise. Is not that true?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator give me an example?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the terms of the bill, men who are not qualified to vote under the laws of the States would be permitted to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to become involved in a discussion with the Senator on the question of qualifications, regulations, or conditions. I undertake to say that under article I, section 4 of the Constitution, we have the right, so far as any regulations are concerned, to alter such regulations if made by a State.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not to prescribe qualifications.

Mr. LUCAS. Absolutely not. The Senator from Illinois has never at any time suggested that we take away the constitutional qualifications. Under the oath which the soldier must take, he must certify with respect to the constitutional qualifications of age, citizenship, and residence. I know what the Senator is driving at. That is a question which is debatable. There are good lawyers on both sides of the aisle who take different positions with respect to the constitutionality of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. The very heart of the right to vote, under the Constitution of Mississippi, is registration before a State official chosen for that purpose and the ability of the one who seeks to register to read and give a reasonable interpretation of a section of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that the Congress of the United States has the authority to strike down these State qualifications?

Mr. LUCAS. Take the case of a boy from the Senator's State who went into the Army when he was 20 years old. He has been in the Army for 2 years. He has never had an opportunity to register and could not have registered if he had so desired. Does the Senator think that that boy should be disfranchised?

Mr. EASTLAND. We have an absentee voters' law in the State of Mississippi which will take care of him. That is a matter which should be left to the States.

Furthermore, with reference to the powers of the proposed commission, if the ballot commission acts as all other Government commissions have acted, its power will be unlimited. Such commissions care nothing for the law. They care nothing for congressional intent. There is no greed in the world comparable to the greed of a governmental department for power, and the proposed commission would take whatever power it desired. Under the terms of the pending bill, authority would be given the commission to hire as many agents as it might desire.

This bill, if enacted into law, would send carpetbaggers into the South to control the elections. The commission would send a horde of agents, sneaks, and snoopers over the country to dominate the next election. The situation in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio would be worse than it would be in my State of Mississippi, because my State is "in the bag." The proposed legislation is the first step toward Federal control, toward bureaucratic control of the entire election machinery of this country.

The bill is called a soldiers' vote bill. The Senator has not stopped there. He would give the right of ballot to members of the merchant marine, civilians, and others who are not in the armed forces of this country. The bill, if enacted into law, would destroy the sacred principle of the control of each State over its own election machinery and the right of the State to define the qualifications of its electors.

Mr. LUCAS. If we disfranchise 6,000,000 soldiers from voting in the next election the Senator can tell them that when they come back.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not propose to disfranchise any of them. We do not want Federal qualifications for voting, and Federal control of elections.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have permitted the Senator to make quite a speech in my time. I merely wish to answer him.

Mr. President, if we disfranchise 6,000,000 voters next year—and that is exactly what will happen unless we enact some kind of Federal legislation—when these soldiers return they will tell their story with respect to the failure of the Senate and the House of Representatives to enact legislation which would give them the opportunity to vote. They will charge the Congress with tragic failure. The people will agree with them.

I ask in all seriousness, if the individual who is willing to lay down his life for his country is not entitled to vote, then who is?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. If he is not entitled to vote, who is? I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the question of voting by absentee ballots from the States. I can convince any fair and reasonable man that it cannot be done. I can convince any fair and prudent mind that not a single soldier from the State of Illinois who is serving outside the continental limits of the United States could vote under the absentee ballot law of the State of Illinois. I am not condemning anybody for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. That is the situation which exists, Mr. President. I say that in this hour of peril the Congress of the United States has a duty to perform in enacting some kind of constructive legislation which will permit the soldier to have the opportunity to vote.

I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator says that soldiers from his State could not vote under the State's absentee voting system. I have before me some figures prepared by the War Department with respect to the Senator's State. From Springfield, Ill., the capital of the Senator's State, there is regular air-mail service to the farthest point in the Middle East. Under the State system, ballots could be sent from Springfield to that area and returned in 20 days.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator where he obtained that information?

Mr. EASTLAND. The information came from Colonel Cutler, in the War Department. It was given to me by the ranking Democrat on the House committee which has already defeated the bill which we have under discussion.



Mr. LUCAS. Colonel Cutler does not give me the same figures. Colonel Cutler has also stated that he was misquoted in connection with certain figures.

Mr. EASTLAND. My information is contained in a letter from Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, a Representative from Mississippi, dated November 22.

Mr. LUCAS. Is Mr. RANKIN interested in this bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; he is interested in this bill. He helped kill this bill in the other House.

Mr. President, we have a duty, of course, to see that those members of the armed forces who are qualified to vote under the laws of each State shall have the opportunity to vote; but it is our first duty to be loyal to the oath we took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has given certain figures. I did not want to enter into a debate upon this question. It is not germane to the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. These are the figures which were given me by Colonel Cutler, who has made a special study of this subject:

From an overseas point in the North American area to Springfield, Ill., 22 days.

From an overseas point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill., 37 days—

Mr. EASTLAND. From where?

Mr. LUCAS. From an overseas point in the European theater, 37 days. The information does not state where the point is.

From an overseas point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill., 43 days.

From an overseas point in the Far East to Springfield, Ill., 52 days.

There is only one area, namely, the North American area, which is within the 30-day period specified in the absentee-balloting law which has been written by the legislators of my State. Within that period of 22 days there must be five mail services. Under the absentee-ballot law of the State of Illinois, the first thing the individual must do is request a form. That represents one mail service. The form is returned from the county clerk to the soldier. That is the second mail service. Then when the form is returned to the county clerk there is a third mail service. The county clerk then sends the absentee voter a ballot, which is the fourth mail service, and the ballot is then returned, which is the fifth mail service.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say—

Mr. LUCAS. Please wait a moment. Under the figures which have been given by Colonel Cutler there was provision made for only three mail services, and when we have two more even the 22 days required in our State go up to more than 30. So that is why I say there is not a single soldier in the State of Illinois who is fighting outside the continental limits of the United States who will have an opportunity to vote under present State laws unless we enact some type of Federal legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will state to the distinguished Senator that under Colonel Cutler's figures, with respect to the Alaskan area, from Springfield to the nearest point in Alaska and back to Springfield requires 14 days; the farthest point in Alaska, 17 days. In the Pacific area, the nearest point, 18 days; the farthest point, 30 days. In the Canal Zone, 13 days. In the Caribbean area, the nearest, 12 days; farthest, 16 days. South Atlantic area, nearest, 14 days; farthest, 16 days. In the Middle East area, nearest, 18 days; farthest, 20 days. In the Persian Gulf area, 22 days. In the Far East area, nearest, 30 days; farthest, 46 days. In the Mediterranean area, nearest long haul, 21 days; short haul, 18 days; farthest long haul, 26 days; short haul, 22 days. In the North Atlantic area, nearest, 14 days; farthest, 24 days.

That is by regular mail service. When we extend the right, as we can do, of transportation of the ballots by air mail, the War Department has said that the time can be materially reduced.

I will say to the Senator that I am sure the State officials of Illinois desire to see that the soldier is given the privilege to vote. As for the time it takes to get the ballot to the soldier, the soldier's family and all those interested in his welfare are going to see that the ballot is rushed to him. In my judgment nine-tenths of the men in the armed forces can vote under the State absentee voting laws today. According to the time schedule of present Air Mail Service, the War Department has said that when priority is given the transportation of these ballots the time of transportation can be materially reduced. So I see no necessity for the Senator's bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss that matter at the present time; it is not at all germane to the pending amendment; but I suggest to the Senator that he consult Colonel Cutler, and I will guarantee that Colonel Cutler will give to him the same figures he has given me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator that my information is that the figures I have given were filed by Colonel Cutler with the House committee.

Mr. LUCAS. There must be some mistake about these two sets of figures. He gave me the set of figures which I just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have before me a letter from the ranking Democrat on the House committee, who I see is now on the Senate floor, and I should like to say further that the House committee is 9 to 4 against this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care what may be the position of the House committee, and I am not going to yield to discuss what has happened in the House. If the bill ever gets over there, very well, but I do not think it is at all pertinent to the issue to discuss what the House of Representatives may have done or may do.

Now, Mr. President, I return to the amendment which is before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I yield. The Senator is about to discuss the amendment, is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. In relation to it I wish the Senator would refer to page 30, subsection (b) appearing near the top of the page. It reads as follows:

In order to expedite the transmission of ballots cast outside the United States to the appropriate election officials, the commission may establish such regional offices as may be necessary to receive such ballots, sort them out, and forward them to the appropriate secretaries of state.

Now, let us see what that means? It means that they can set up regional offices. It does not say that the agency which directs the regional office will have to be bipartisan in nature, that is part Republican and part Democratic. It means, for instance, that in my section of the country we could have a regional office to cater to the six New England States, and New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and that under all the restrictions in the bill the office could be set up in Jersey City under Hague.

The Senator has said that the commission does not have any power; but, if the Senator will look at the bill, I think he will see that he has tried to build a halo of insignificance around the commission which is not warranted by the text of the measure, or by the powers or responsibilities conferred on the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am certain that the two Republicans on the commission will take care of all the speculative troubles of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is really in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that an amendment is now pending.

Mr. SMITH. I simply ask that my amendment lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. President, I have listened to the debate, and am distressed at the thought that men who were elected by the voters of 48 sovereign States, recognizing the sovereignty of those States, should contend over a bill which would destroy that sovereignty from beginning to end. There are Members of the Senate who know that whenever we delegate to another power to determine the qualifications of the voter we have destroyed State's rights. That is what this bill would do.

In my amendment I have provided a means which seems to me to be very reasonable and logical. A year would be afforded in which to prepare ourselves. Every State would prepare lists of the qualified voters in the armed services. They would transmit them to the proper authorities to distribute among the absentee voters. The machinery would be set up by the State. We forget that 48 States make up this Government. Anyone who reads the history of the constitutional amendments knows that it is

States' rights that will suffer by the delegation of power. By the very force of circumstances, however, we are coming to consider this city to be the center of all government for America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator that we must maintain States' rights. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree that if the present Green-Lucas bill becomes law it will be attacked in the courts as being unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH. What courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. Where would we be if the act should be declared unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH. Exactly. Mr. President, I have heard the statement made on the floor of the Senate by one in whose constitutional knowledge I have confidence—I do not know how much his heart was devoted to it—that he thought the vote by an absentee voter is paramount to the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If this bill becomes law, will the Senator get ready to welcome the carpetbaggers back to South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. We have them everywhere now. Sometimes it even looks as though the Senate is made up of them.

Mr. President, I am in deadly earnest about the preservation of the Constitution. Without it we would have anarchy, and the proposal to set up a Federal commission to regulate, not only the votes of absentee soldier patriots, but of p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s, would aim a fatal blow at the very foundation of our Government. Have we drifted so far away from our love and devotion to the Constitution that we are willing to twist it whenever the circumstances suit us?

I have drafted an amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill which would give each State the right to list its qualified absentee voters, send the list to the Army and Navy heads, in turn to be submitted to whatever division the absentee voters are in, and then give such voters the right to fill out their ballots, seal them, return them, and have them transmitted to the respective States of which the voters are citizens.

Why all this ado about a commission, and why is it proposed that every one of the armed forces without exception may vote? I heard awhile ago in the debate that the question of the qualifications of the men should not be considered, but every man willing to die for his country should be allowed to vote. Some men in the armed services may be murders on parole; some of them may be guilty of crimes which disqualify them in the States of their residence, but nevertheless, they are qualified to vote in this glorious hour. We must not lose sight of fundamental things, or the action we take may return to plague us. I believe in each State having the right to regulate its own voting and to determine the

qualifications of its electors. I stood here, as every other Senator did, and took a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, without any mental reservation. Yet, measures are advocated by men who ought to be ashamed of themselves in view of the oath they took, and some are contending that a soldier's vote is paramount to the Constitution.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator know of any provision in the Constitution that declares that when a Senator takes his oath to support the Constitution there is some higher law that must be considered in connection with living by his oath of office?

Mr. SMITH. I think when the average man takes an oath without any mental reservation that precludes any possibility of his voting for a proposal which is absolutely unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I have watched the progress of the Senate for a long time. It seems to me we are degenerating into a most unfortunate condition. We seem to forget the Constitution, and I doubt very much if many of us have ever read the decisions of the Supreme Court when we had a Supreme Court and its decisions were worth reading. When the "twilight zone" between the delegated powers and the reserved powers would come into question, with clear brain and full knowledge of the facts the Court would render decisions that have guided us until this hour. God knows what is to become of us from now on; I do not know.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to criticize or to be personal, but this bill to me is the most disgusting and infamous thing ever introduced into the Senate of the United States. Anyone who will read it will find that it has an objective which, in my opinion, in a sense, involves throwing the Constitution out the window. We ought to recognize the sovereign right of the States; they furnished the boys; they are taxed to support them; and yet, when it comes to giving them the vote, it is said, "Let the Federal Government run that."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In the Senator's remarks he referred to some individuals being "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s," and to the doctrine of States' rights. May I pay tribute today to the outstanding advocate of States' rights, the p-a-t-r-i-o-t, Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. SMITH. Do not mention Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. TOBEY. You have recently honored the memory of Thomas Jefferson by erecting a mausoleum of beauty and marble on the borders of the Potomac's Basin; but while honoring the man you

have forsaken his teachings and his faith in States' rights. They went into the discard 10 years ago.

Mr. SMITH. We will not mention Thomas Jefferson, or George Washington, or any of the miserable wretches who laid the foundation of the great Constitution under which we are now living. I am surprised the Senator should mention the names of those men here. They are despised by men who belong to a certain political faith and who control things now.

I did not intend to get into this subject; I merely wanted to stand here and voice my opposition to this miserable bill which is in contravention of constitutional principles.

The idea of sending boys out yonder and saying they are fighting to maintain the Constitution while we are breaking it. That is a hell of a note. Boys, yours and mine and those of our fellow citizens, are over there fighting.

Talking about our war policy, I want somebody to write it out for me. I try to be a patriot, not a "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t," though I do not object to having the pay coming along, but this whole thing smells of partisan business. Here is the Senator from New Hampshire trying to get the Republicans a little hand-hold and the Senator from Illinois saying, No, it is ours; you stay out of it; it is ours; we have so worded it and we are going to have it that way. [Laughter.] Let the States determine the qualified voters, and send the list not to a commission but to the proper officers to be transmitted to the men in the armed forces wherever they may be. For God's sake let us be men for once and stop being mugwumps. I have sat here and listened to this debate and it is enough to turn the stomach even of new dealers.

Senator, let us be serious about this matter. How many Members of the Senate believe that this bill accords with the Constitution, and respects the dignity and the rights of 48 sovereign States? Do not forget that they still own America. We talk about what we are going to do next year. I hope the voters of America will say, "Now, we will show you who is boss." We must not forget that the States made the Constitution and the States have the right to repeal it. If three-fourths of the States of the Union were to meet in solemn convention assembled and declare that all powers delegated to the Federal Government were withdrawn, where would we be?

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In addressing the Senate, as the Senator always does eloquently and interestingly, he is facing the Republican side of the aisle. Is there a deep significance in that? Is it not because he knows that on this side of the aisle there is fertile ground, where the seeds of Americanism, States' rights, and the doctrines of the Constitution, have taken root and flourish? Is that not the reason why he faces this side?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know; the dirt is pretty deep. [Laughter.] I wish now



to refer to something that occurred recently, when I was sitting with a number of Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator face the front so that we can all hear? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. I will face this miserable crowd on the Democratic side. [Laughter.] In the group to which I have referred a Republican said, "If all Democrats were like Ed SMITH we would not be in such a bad fix," and they said some complimentary things about me and my State. I replied, "I believe Einstein is right. He has said that everything depends on relativity, that a thing is a yard long because it is three times longer than a foot. By the same token I know how low I have sunk." "How is that?" I said, "A dirty, stinking Republican looks good to me now." [Laughter.] I repeat, I have reached the point where republicanism and democracy mean nothing to me. The question is, Are you an American? Do you love the Constitution? I do not care whether a man was born in Vermont or whether he was born in South Carolina, provided he loves his Government, and the splendid rights it gives the individual and the States, keeping the Government as near the people as possible, and maintaining it there.

But here we are, spending days and hours and a few billion dollars—for what purpose? To disrupt and destroy the Government which we love and to which we are devoted. There is not a man here present but who seriously thinks the Government is in danger. Every man believes that to be so. Why should we not believe it when we hear such talk as has been going on here this afternoon? It is not a question of saying, Do you believe this is constitutional, do you believe the States have a right to name their voters, and the qualifications of the voters? There is not a man here today who has sense enough to be a Senator—I mean who has votes enough—but knows there is not a single item in the Constitution, from article I to the last amendment which has been added—and which weakened it—which gives a right to the Federal Government to prescribe the qualifications of the voters in the States.

I am not pleading about the poll tax. I will let the "polecats" run that. The names are in a way synonymous. The poll tax is nothing in the world but a camouflage to enrage a race that does not understand it. The repeal of the poll-tax law, even in my State, would not result in one more vote, not one. We hear much said about the members of one race going overseas and fighting and dying. Mr. President, do you suppose a man who wanted to vote would not pay a dollar to vote? I have no brief for the poll tax; I do not think it should ever have been made a qualification for voting; but it is on the statute books, it is the law in my State, and, by the eternal gods, I shall observe it.

Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of saying I had offered a substitute for the bill, which would give each State the

right to submit a list of its qualified voters, and to add to it from time to time, and to have the ballots distributed to the voters, wherever they may be, and, when they vote—the vote to be secret—have the ballots sent back to the States of which the voters are citizens. Anything outside of that is an absolute contravention of the Constitution and I, for one, took my oath a long time ago, solemnly swearing that I would uphold the Constitution against enemies both foreign and domestic. Was it not a wonderful thing to have inserted in that oath the word "domestic"? God knows we have domestic enemies. Both foreign and domestic, without any mental reservation. A man who will forswear himself should be kicked out of this body, because a man who will swear a lie and then live it is not fit to be a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I felt like rising and expressing myself to those here who are quarreling about who will get the major part of the soldier vote, the Republicans or the Democrats. I do not give a darn, just so they vote as American citizens.

I am greatly worried about the situation. I have not very much longer to live. I know there are many who wish to God my time would be shortened [laughter]; but I am not going to die until I have to. I am going to fight for the right of my countrymen to express themselves, and to live under the Constitution. I do not believe in turning America over to an international group. We have never gotten anything out of the international group but some very unworthy immigrants.

Mr. President, I like to have a man rise and discuss facts. I do not object to any one differing with me so long as he is sincere, but I do despise a whippersnapper, who I know does not believe a word he is saying, coming around and stating "You do so and so." I feel like slapping the dog down. Senators have noticed day after day some little slick head telling them he believes so and so. He does not believe anything. If he ever had a bright original idea he would die of apoplexy. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is time for us to be men and representatives of sovereign States.

A Senator sitting in front of me a few days ago rose and said he believed the soldiers' right to vote was paramount to the Constitution. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] replied, and I intend to cut out and preserve what he said. His comment was not studied; it was the spontaneous ebullition of a real American statesman.

I hope my little castigation of our great constitutional statesmen will result in Senators voting to maintain the Constitution, and throwing this miserable bill out the window. It is not worthy of being considered by the Senate of the United States.

Oh, we hear someone say, "I want the boys to vote. I want the boys to vote—providing they vote for me." [Laughter.]

#### THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM— SUBSIDIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, one of the most stupendous assignments that ever confronted any Chief Executive of our Nation was the job of transforming us a peace-loving people, into one of the most potent fighting machines of all times.

When we realize how woefully unprepared we were only 2 years ago, when treacherously attacked at Pearl Harbor, and are now able to assert that we have the most powerful Navy on the seas, one of the best equipped armies in the field, and the most formidable air force in the skies, we are prone to ask ourselves, How did all of that come about; how was the miracle performed? Many reasons can be assigned, but I am going to dwell on the one I consider the most important—that is, our stabilization program.

The Price Control Act, as amended, was bound to present many difficulties because it necessarily curbed freedom-loving people in their usual and ordinary methods of carrying on their business. It necessarily encroached on our farmer's right to dispose of his commodities as he had been accustomed. We have come a long way in smoothing out the many obstacles that confronted the administrators of the law, and we are now reaching the point when the purposes of the act are better understood by the vast majority of our people. Its operation is getting progressively better. Mr. President, notwithstanding the vast amount of criticism that has been heaped upon our stabilization program, I predict that, when the war clouds fade away, it will stand out as a key factor we will look to in weighing the causes that saved our economy—our free-enterprise society—during this grave emergency.

Mr. President, I ask the Members of the Senate, Would it not be dangerous, would it not be folly, would it not lead to disaster, for us to abandon our present course in our fight for stabilization? As I have just indicated, we have come a long way. We started in the valley—our trail has been strenuous, it has been tortuous, it has brought many headaches to us and to the administrators of our program. But we have reached the crest. Our people have learned by experience the necessity for stabilization, and it would be tragic, to say the least, for us to deviate from our present course.

Mr. President, I do not like subsidies. We from the South are traditionally opposed to any form of subsidy. However, I am unable to devise any method that will more effectively stave off inflation than the utilization of subsidies in our fight for stabilization—nor, for that matter, has anyone else to my knowledge.

In considering this problem let us cast aside politics, let us not force it into an issue between the farmers on one side, the consumers on another, or, for that matter, as an issue between any of the particular groups that are upholding or opposing subsidies. Let us rather look at it in the light of protecting our economy and our whole system of free enterprise.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no doubt that the only alternative to subsidies is higher prices of consumer goods. Higher prices of consumer goods means a higher cost of living, and a higher cost of living will beget higher wages, and higher wages will again mean higher costs of consumer goods, and soon our economy will become enmeshed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people but will curtail our productivity now, and almost destroy it in post-war years.

Mr. President, I refuse to believe that the farmers of our Nation are set against subsidies or incentive payments in view of present circumstances. I venture to say they are being misrepresented by some of these high-pressure representatives of farm organizations throughout the country. I visited many parts of my State last summer, and I was agreeably surprised to learn that my people were for price control and for rationing. The vast majority of them were wholeheartedly for the stabilization program, notwithstanding the fact that it was badly managed at its inception. I am not contending that the farmers of my State fundamentally like subsidies, but when one explains to them how subsidies work, and how the system has had the effect of preventing inflation, they express satisfaction. I know they fear inflation. They do not favor run-away prices. Mr. President, it is my contention that if we let the bars down and permit the cost of living to rise—as it will, as sure as night follows day—the chief sufferers, when judgment day comes, will be the farmers of our Nation. I believe the farmers know that.

Farmers have benefited greatly from our war-food policy and from the stabilization program. Let us compare the aggregate net income of the American farmers, after all expenses, during some specific periods in the past with their receipts for the present year. The average aggregate net income of farmers in the years 1935 to 1939, both inclusive, the 5 years preceding the war, was \$4,668,000,000. This year it will be over \$12,000,000,000. Why, Senators, total farm income stands at the highest point in our history. It is almost three times its pre-war level. Likewise, per capita net farm income in 1943 will be practically triple the pre-war year of 1939, and it will be three and one-half times what it was in the years 1910-14, the period that is utilized for agricultural parity.

This increased income is not confined to any one type or group of farmers, but it extends to all of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us what the dollars and cents per capita income of farmers will be in 1943? How many dollars?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can easily figure that out. The net income will be \$12,000,000,000, and I think there are about 6,000,000 farmers in the United States. That would mean an average net income of \$2,000 per family.

Mr. AIKEN. There are about 30,000,000 persons on farms.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about right.

Mr. AIKEN. That is about \$400 per capita. Is that exorbitant?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not. I should personally like to give the farmers much more than they are receiving, but I fear that if we attempt to do that by raising the prices of their commodities, they—the farmers—will suffer a great deal in the resulting inflation. On the other hand, an average net income of \$400 per person in the farm family is not such a bad income.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator familiar with the statistics issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, I believe it is, showing that 68 percent of the farmers of the

United States have less than \$1,000 a year income on which to support their families?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with some of the statistics, but not the ones to which the Senator refers. I would hazard a guess, however, that the statistics to which the Senator refers are not up to date.

Mr. AIKEN. And that is not an exorbitant income, either?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I grant that to the Senator. Many of the smaller farmers of the South whose main crop is cotton have extremely low incomes.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a table which I should like to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks. It shows the rise in income of all types of farmers while the stabilization program has been in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Net cash income above expenses of typical commercial family-operated farms  
1935-39 TO 1942 AND 1943

Type of farm	Location	Dollars increased income, 1942 over average 1935-39	Farm net cash income		
			1935-39	1940	1942
1. Wheat farms.....	Winter wheat area.....	\$3,700	\$1,990	\$1,670	\$5,690
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock.....	do.....	3,264	1,700	1,600	4,960
3. Cash grain.....	Corn Belt.....	3,204	1,800	2,100	5,000
4. Hog-beef breeding, fattening.....	do.....	2,626	1,300	1,380	3,930
5. Wheat, corn, livestock.....	Winter wheat area.....	2,548	1,400	1,260	3,950
6. Hog, dairy.....	Corn Belt.....	1,331	1,080	839	2,420
7. Dairy.....	Wisconsin.....	1,078	1,110	1,270	2,190
8. Dairy.....	New York.....	1,040	960	1,200	2,000
9. Flue cured tobacco.....	Virginia.....	656	800	740	1,460
10. Texas black waxy prairie.....	Cotton area.....	400	500	500	500
11. Georgia 2-mule.....	do.....	248	300	330	643
12. Mississippi Delta 2-mule.....	do.....	306	300	246	610
13. Fire-cured tobacco.....	do.....	232	200	300	430

INFORMATION ON 1943 SO FAR AS AVAILABLE

1. Wheat farms.....	Winter wheat area.....	\$4,800	\$1,990	\$1,670	\$6,770
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock.....	do.....	4,539	1,700	1,598	6,240
3. Wheat, corn, livestock.....	do.....	3,220	1,400	1,260	4,620

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary.

<sup>2</sup> 1943.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Nov. 5, 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the table shows on typical commercial family-operated farms the net cash income above expenses. Take the wheat farmer in the winter-wheat area. The dollars increase in income in 1942 over the average of 1935-39 was \$3,700. Farm net cash income in 1935-39 was \$1,990. In 1940 it was \$1,670, and in 1942 it was \$5,690. In 1943 it will be about \$6,770.

Take wheat, grain, sorghum, and livestock farms. In 1942 the increase over the average of 1935-39 was \$3,264.

The typical net income of this type of farm in 1935-39 was \$1,700. In 1942 it was \$4,960. In 1943 it will be \$6,240.

On the other hand take a cotton farmer of the Mississippi Delta 2-mule type. His increased income in 1942 over the average income for the years 1935-39 was \$306. His net farm-cash income for 1935-39 was \$300, for 1940 it was \$240,

and for 1942, \$610. The income is small but there is evidence of great improvement during this war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand the Senator to say that that increase in the farm income is due to the fact that subsidies have been provided?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is due to our stabilization program. As I will indicate in my remarks as I proceed, the prices that the farmers pay for what they use on the farm have increased only about one-third as much as they did during World War No. 1, and that accounts to a large extent for the farmer's increased net income.

Mr. WHERRY. We have had a limited acreage in operation since Decem-



ber 1942. Could we not have had an increased production if the limitation in acreage had been taken off?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but the Senator realizes that most of the acres on which production of certain crops was limited were put into producing food we needed most urgently and that with less acreage we have been able to increase our farm production by 25 percent during this war in contrast with World War No. 1, when the increase was only 5 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We could have increased it a great deal more if we had had no limitations on acreages during the years 1940, 1941, and 1942; could we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps that is true, if we had had the labor and everything else that were required.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as I have indicated, on an acreage which is probably from 10 to 15 percent less than what we had in 1918, during World War No. 1, we have been able to produce 25 percent more farm commodities.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am especially interested in livestock, and I very much appreciate the contribution the Senator is making today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will reach the point of livestock in just a moment. If the Senator does not mind waiting, I would prefer that he question me when I enter into a discussion of that subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall do so then.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have indicated, the table to which I referred does not show increases for the wheat farmers and cattle farmers only, but shows them for all classes of farmers. I ask the Members of the Senate to study the table which I have had incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it might be of interest to Senators to compare prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 1, when we had very limited price controls and no subsidies, with prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 2. Those prices are indicated in a table entitled "Comparative Price Increases Over Four Years of Two World Wars." The table is a very illuminating one, Mr. President. It shows that in terms of the total cost of living, the percent price increase in World War No. 1—that is, from July 1914 to July 1918—was 50.3. That was for the total cost of living for the first 4 years of World War No. 1. For the first 4 years of the present war—that is, from August 1939, to August 1943—the percent increase in the total cost of living, was

24.9. In other words, it has been less than half the percent price increase in World War No. 1.

For 61 retail food items, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 63.9; during World War No. 2, 46.7.

For 111 items of clothing, in World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 85.3; during World War No. 2, 28.5.

For 39 items of house furnishings, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 77.2; during World War No. 2, 24.8.

Take wholesale prices: On a total of 889 items, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 96.1; during World War No. 2, only 37.5.

For 111 items of raw materials, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 102.1; during World War No. 2, 69.5.

Mr. President, now let us take some selected manufactured items at wholesale. For instance, let us consider steel plates. On steel plates, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 187.4; during World War No. 2 there has been no price increase whatever.

On copper ingots, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 90.3; during World War No. 2, only 14.

I may say parenthetically that that situation results from the subsidy payments made on copper production. As I recall the figures, the Government is actually saving \$28 for every dollar of subsidy paid out.

With further reference to comparative wholesale price increases, we find that during World War No. 1 the percent price increase on plate glass was 76.1; during the present war there has been no price increase whatever.

On wool blankets, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 164.7; during the present World War, 50.

On men's cotton hosiery, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 132.3; during the present war, 71.9.

On blue denims, which are so widely used by the workmen throughout this country, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 214.8; during the present war, 74.5.

Look at the contrast when we compare price movements of the things sold by farmers in the two wars. Cattle rose 58 percent last war, 89 percent this. Hogs rose 102 percent during World War No. 1, but 150 percent during this war. Corn rose 106 percent last war, 139 percent this. The general picture is clear. Things sold by farmers have gone up more than in the last war; things bought by farmers much less. Here is tangible proof of the benefits of stabilization to the farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative price increases over 4 years of 2 world wars

	1914-18 World War No. 1 (percent price increase) <sup>1</sup>	1939-43 World War No. 2 (percent price increase) <sup>2</sup>
Cost of living, total <sup>3</sup> .....	50.3	24.9
Food (61 items).....	63.9	46.7
Clothing (111 items).....	85.3	28.5
House furnishings (39 items).....	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total (889 items).....	96.1	37.5
Raw materials (111 items).....	102.1	69.5
Semimanufactures (99 items).....	131.3	24.7
Finished products (679 items).....	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities <sup>4</sup> (709 items).....	92.4	21.2
Selected manufactured items:		
Steel plates (tank).....	187.4	0
Copper ingots.....	90.3	14
Plate glass.....	76.1	0
Wool blankets.....	164.7	50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's).....	132.3	71.9
Blue denims.....	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities.....	91	119
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods.....	78	116
Selected agricultural items:		
Cattle.....	58	89
Hogs.....	102	150
Corn.....	106	139
Milk.....	46	94
Butter fat.....	73	122
Wheat.....	165	133
Corn.....	106	139
Prices paid by farmers for 174 commodities and for interest and taxes.....	71	34

<sup>1</sup> July 1914 to July 1918.

<sup>2</sup> August 1939 to August 1943.

<sup>3</sup> Rent and fuel, not available by months.

<sup>4</sup> All commodities other than farm products and foods.

<sup>5</sup> To May 1943, the latest available.

<sup>6</sup> 1914 to 1918, not available for World War No. 1 period.

Source: Farm prices, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; others, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has referred to the subsidy on copper as having brought about great savings. Let me say that the situation in regard to copper is somewhat extraordinary; that is to say, on copper we have a two-price system. The producing mines—the mines which produce most of the copper, which were in operation previous to the war, and which have continued in operation—produce at one price. Another price is offered as an incentive to new copper mines. Copper is a little different in another respect: The Government takes all the copper; it purchases all the copper. Copper is not a commodity which goes out to the general public.

Mr. ELLENDER. It does to some extent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is restricted. The general public cannot get any copper. There has been such a shortage that even the Rural Electrification Administration has not been able to get any copper.

Mr. ELLENDER. I grant that the use of copper has been greatly curtailed; nevertheless, quite a good deal has been channeled for public use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I am endeavoring to make is that to hold out copper as a case in justification of the application of subsidies is erroneous.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not agree with the Senator. The case may be an extreme one, but the facts remain that by subsidizing small producers the Government saved many millions of dollars. Mr. President, it will be noted from the table I have just had inserted in the Record that farm prices have risen substantially more during the present war than in the last war. As a matter of fact, they have increased 28 percent more than in World War No. 1; and yet retail food prices have gone up much less—only 47 percent, as against 64 percent, or 17 percent less—than in World War No. 1. Why is that? One of the important reasons is that under our present system of price control, with the aid of subsidies, we have been better able to control the middleman's margins. We have been able to prevent the pyramiding of mark-ups by reducing prices of commodities at early stages of distribution, through the use of subsidies. On the other hand, subsidies have made it possible to permit higher farm prices without seriously affecting the cost of living. This has been accomplished by having the Government absorb a part of the higher costs to the farmers without having to raise the price of their commodities to consumers.

Mr. President, the farmers of today are paying substantially less for what they buy in their farming operations than they did during World War No. 1. Notwithstanding the fact that, as a rule, prices of what farmers buy usually keep pace—or more—with the rise in prices of what they sell, prices of commodities that the farmers must buy have risen only 34 percent in this war, as compared with a rise of 119 percent of the things the farmers sell. In World War No. 1, on the other hand, while prices farmers received rose 91 percent, prices farmers pay rose 71 percent. There is no doubt that much of the cause of the present good fortune of the farmers—one of the prime causes of their favorable income position—is the stabilization program, which has so markedly held down the cost of the things the farmers buy, while permitting much greater increases in the prices farmers receive.

So much for the farmers. Now, let us turn our attention to what the stabilization program has meant in savings in the cost of the war to the American taxpayers. Subsidies cost money, but inflation costs taxpayers infinitely more.

Prices of iron and steel, on the average, rose 139 percent during the first 4 years of World War No. 1. During the first 4 years of this war they have risen only 1.4 percent. As a result the wartime steel consumption of the Government, which this year is taking roughly 80 percent of the total steel production, has cost almost \$10,000,000,000 less than if the steel used had had to be purchased at the prices which prevailed during World War No. 1. On the entire war program, it has been estimated by competent economists, the savings to our Gov-

ernment have been about \$67,000,000,000 in comparison to what the same war program would have cost at World War No. 1 inflated prices. In addition, the consumers of our Nation would have had to pay \$22,000,000,000 more for the goods and services they have consumed in the last 4 years if they had had to pay World War No. 1 prices for them.

Mr. President, as I indicated a while ago, if the Congress should make the mistake of dispensing with subsidies, inflation is bound to come, and when judgment day comes—that is, when deflation sets in—the farmers will be the first to suffer. I am sure that the situation which held true following World War No. 1 will hold true following World War No. 2, unless inflation is prevented. The records show that prices received by farmers fell by 41 percent from their high point between 1920 and 1921, whereas the prices paid by farmers for what they needed on the farm fell by only 18 percent in the same period. And that is not the whole story. The prices farmers received maintained a steady downward fall and remained at low ebb until the present war broke out, whereas the prices farmers paid stayed up for many years. American agriculture could not stand a repetition of this disaster. The way to avoid it is to prevent inflation.

Mr. President, as I pointed out to the Senate a moment ago, our country has made wonderful strides in its industrial and agricultural expansion during the war. There is no question that inflation would undermine both our war and our food programs. During World War No. 1, industrial production rose until the middle of 1917, when it exceeded pre-war production by about 25 percent. But thereafter, when inflation really set in, industrial production dropped off. During this war, by contrast, with industrial prices stabilized to a very substantial degree, industrial production has climbed much more markedly and steadily. The Federal Reserve index of industrial production reached 203 in April 1943 and stood at 205 in July, based on August of 1939 as 100. This phenomenal rise has been steady since early 1941, when price control began. It can be attributed in considerable measure to the stability of industrial prices and to the wartime stabilization program in general, which has prevented the profound disruptions which all agree inflation causes.

Farm production has also done much better during this war than the last. During this war farm production has risen almost 25 percent during the first 4 years, in contrast to only 5 percent in the first 4 years of World War No. 1. It is the stabilization of prices in the industrial segments of our economy which accounts in large part for the better showing. I repeat, the food-subsidy program deserves support as a necessary means to protect the vital stabilization program—to avert the utter disaster of inflation.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, subsidies permit adequate farm prices without materially increasing the cost of

living and without endangering stabilization. They do not lower farm prices. Any producer who complains that under the subsidy program he is not getting enough for his product is misguided in attacking the subsidy as the cause of the difficulty he claims to be experiencing. The subsidy does not keep down the returns received by farmers. The prices farmers get are fixed by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration at the levels those agencies feel are necessary and proper in view of wartime needs for full-speed agricultural production. If it is decided that the retail price should not reflect this farm price in full, a subsidy is paid somewhere along the line, ordinarily at the most convenient stage from the standpoint of administration. The mere removal of the subsidy would not increase the producer's return one whit. The only thing that can be said is that if no subsidies were permitted the W. F. A. and the O. P. A. would have less freedom to fix a favorable price to the farmer, since they would have to pay closer attention to its effect on the cost of living. Thus insofar as subsidies affect producer's returns they are price supports.

In the case of almost every subsidized foodstuff, the producer is assured—by means of price supports—of the higher price which the subsidy permits the purchaser of his product to pay. For all subsidized foods except meats this has been the case over the entire period during which the subsidies have been in effect. A support price for hogs has been in effect since long before the meat subsidy began, and steps have very recently been taken to insure that the price of hogs will not fall through the support price, despite record movement of hogs to market. The W. F. A. and the O. P. A. have shown effective cooperation in making this difficult support program effective by relaxing slaughtering restrictions and encouraging pork consumption. The new beef cattle program, by denying a subsidy to packers who pay less than support prices for cattle, helps insure that the average prices received by cattle growers will reflect the subsidy paid to slaughterers. I propose to discuss this program in some detail later in the course of my remarks.

In the case of butter, hogs, canning crops, fruits for processing, potatoes, sugar beets, eggs, poultry, processed milk products, peanuts, and a large number of other products, the Commodity Credit Corporation contracts to purchase at fixed support prices any portion of the supply which cannot be sold at those prices or higher. While subsidies permit a number of these foods—such as hogs, butter, cheese, canning crops, sugar beets, potatoes, peanuts, prunes, and raisins—to be sold at retail prices which do not reflect in full these higher support prices, the support prices insure that the subsidy will not simply increase the profits of processors and middlemen. For example, in the case of canning crops, only those canners who pay the support price or better for their ingredients are eligible for the subsidy, with-



out which, incidentally, they could not pay the support prices. In other cases, as for example in butter, the market for the dairyman's butterfat is supported by the fact that the C. C. C. will pay 46 cents per pound, Chicago basis, for 92-score butter. In addition there has recently been inaugurated a program by which farmers selling milk, either in the form of fluid milk or in the form of butterfat, receive a subsidy payment from the Defense Supplies Corporation.

In all these cases there is no question that the subsidy is effective in sustaining the return of the producer. Without the subsidies these returns could not be assured—that is, without laying ourselves wide open to uncontrolled and spiraling wages and prices. If higher food prices provoke inflation, the farmer's price may go higher, but his real returns, in terms of what he can buy for that price, will drop and drop disastrously.

Under the former beef subsidy program, it is true, there was no positive guaranty that the subsidy received by the packer would be passed on to the grower, since there was no assurance that temporary supply conditions might not cause the price of cattle to fall, even though the packers, by virtue of the subsidy payments, were in a position to pay higher cattle prices. It was assumed that the brisk demand for meats and the competition among slaughterers would make cattle prices reflect the subsidy in full. At all times, of course, the subsidy encouraged packers to pay higher prices for cattle, so there was no possibility that the subsidy could depress cattle prices. But the system did not make it necessary for the packers to pay this higher price if the market were temporarily glutted with cattle offerings.

Due to several circumstances, entirely unrelated to the subsidy system, there have been times this summer and fall when some of the packers may have been unduly enriched. These circumstances were, in the main, the following: First, the strong seasonal increase in cattle marketings; second, the fact that the supply of cattle had been pent up in the late spring and early summer by the expectation that cattle prices would rise later on, a temporary withholding of supply which was favored by unusually favorable range conditions in some areas; and especially, third, the growing shortage of feeds for cattle finishing relative to the extraordinarily large number of animals.

It accordingly became apparent that under these conditions the subsidy program was not satisfactorily fulfilling one of its important objectives, namely, the assurance of favorable prices to the producer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not wish to interrupt the distinguished Senator from making his speech because I recognize that he is an authority on the matter under discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the fact that the Senator's statistics are authentic

because he usually puts them out in that form.

Let us take one statement which the Senator made. I refer to his statement concerning the subsidy program—that it does not decrease production. Let us take it and apply it to meat. From a realistic point of view, I am very much interested in it, and I have had some realistic experience along that line. Does the Senator recall what price was paid for prime beef at Chicago in 1918?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe I have the figures before me, I will say to the Senator. For what month did the Senator inquire?

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take the highest month in 1918 for prime beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I misunderstood the Senator. I do not have price figures for 1918, except in a general way. It will appear from the table of comparative price increases which I placed in the RECORD a few minutes ago that cattle prices received by farmers rose 58 percent between July 1914 to July 1918 and rose by 89 percent in the comparable 4 years of this war.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. I am talking about the price paid per pound by packers for live cattle. I believe that, if the Senator will examine his figures or obtain the applicable figures, he will find that during the latter part of 1918 and the fore part of 1919 double-A prime beef in Chicago brought as high as \$17 a hundred and, in some instances, \$17.50 a hundred. Today the same cattle, the same quality of beef, cannot possibly bring over \$16 a hundred in the Chicago market. The Senator well knows why.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, the Senator does not mean to say that it is due to the subsidies, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. It is due to the subsidy program.

Mr. ELLENDER. You have not shown that the subsidy itself holds the price down. That is the only point which I made.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I make is that because of the subsidy program the price to be paid the producer is such that, instead of increasing the amount of beef it is decreasing it in our country, and we are surely facing a scarcity of beef because of the subsidy program. The Food Administrator has said that the subsidy goes back to the producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. As the Senator knows, it was not intended that the subsidy should be paid directly to the producers but to the processors, so that the processors in turn could pay to the cattle producers the same price that they had received theretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And give to the consumer the benefit of a lower price.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That program was on the foundation that the processor should pay as high as \$1.10 a hundred over whatever price he paid in the market, provided he did not exceed \$16 a hundred to the cattle seller in Chicago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, that is the new formula which the Senator was speaking of. Under neither the new nor the old plan is the packer supposed to pay the subsidy in addition to the price he pays for the cattle to the seller. The subsidy simply permits the packer to pay a higher price to the seller than he otherwise could pay and sell his cut beef at established ceiling levels.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was present at the Senate committee hearing on subsidies the other day and he knows that I asked the meat buyers if they paid, in addition to the \$16 maximum, a subsidy of \$1.10, and they said that the highest price of \$16 a hundred was under the subsidy to those who produced and fed the cattle to sell on the market.

I wish to point out to the Senator that the highest price we can get for double-A prime beef which brought \$17.50 a hundred during the latter part of 1918 and the fore part of 1919 is \$16. Under the Little Steel formula, which was supposed to balance agriculture and wages, and under which we were permitted as agriculturalists to take the highest price the cattle brought between January 1 and September 15, 1942, which was \$17.80, Chicago, we have had to lower the price from \$17.80 at Chicago to \$16 a hundred.

Mr. ELLENDER. The \$16 price for prime beef reflects a higher average price to the farmer than he got during the period January 1 to September 15, 1942, according to seasonally adjusted prices published by the Secretary of Agriculture. Does the Senator know how the income of the cattle farmer during this war compares with his income received during the last war?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator that there has not been a time in 48 years when the cattle feeder had less margin out of which to feed his cattle than now, and my contention is that it is because of the subsidy program. Under that theory the Food Administrator and the Price Stabilizer have said that the maximum price to be paid is \$16 a hundred, and if we deduct from that what it costs to buy corn and hay, I assert that no producer can feed cattle today in the feed lot and put it on the Chicago market at the price being paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, choice steers sold for \$16.50 to \$16.75 on the Chicago market today. As I understand the new ruling, there is a 1-cent-per-hundredweight margin left so that the producers of certain grades of cattle can compete one with another. Prices can be higher than \$16 per hundredweight so long as the average price paid over a specified period does not exceed \$16. It can even go higher if the processor chooses to do so; however, he would forego his subsidy. Does the Senator not think it is better to have a margin of 1 cent than to have the ceiling in a rigid form?

Mr. WHERRY. Well, that has to do with the different classes of cattle. I am talking about double-A prime beef, and that is where we get our corn-fed beef which we feed to the civilian population and the military forces.



What actually is taking place in this country is that we are creating a scarcity of what we need most for the soldiers and the civilian population, and we are doing it under a subsidy program.

I hope the Senator will yield to me further. I should like to ask him a question because I respect his opinions. We need beef and the soldiers need beef. Most of the beef we get today is unfinished beef. It comes from the slaughter of small calves and canner cows. This type of beef does not provide the nutrition that is obtained from the old-type double-A prime beef. We need that kind of beef. But today the cattle feeder is operating on a margin so narrow that he is going out of business.

Let me cite an instance which occurred in my county: I live only 8 miles from the Kansas line. Between our farm where we had cattle for feeding and the Kansas line there is not one cattle feeder who has in his feed lots today any cattle which are needed to be fattened in order to provide beef for this country. Why is it? Because when cattle are shipped to Chicago the seller receives \$16 a hundred, and on the \$16 basis under the subsidy should be added \$1.10, which the producer does not get but which the processor hands back to the consumer. The market ratio is made so narrow that it is taking cattle out of the feed lot.

The results expected to be achieved through the subsidy program are in contradiction with the facts. We are not getting cattle, and in 6 months the Senator will be on the floor asking for an increase in the supply of beef, not only for the military forces but for the civilian population.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not like to interrupt, but I might contribute a little to what the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Nebraska have said.

Between 50 and 51 percent of all beef being slaughtered this fall is from cows and heifers. It is the first time in a long, long while that such a condition has prevailed. I think it is about 50½ percent. Those cows and heifers do not bring 16 cents a pound.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, the Senator attended the hearings held sometime ago before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Everytime I had occasion to be present I asked the witnesses what was the remedy. Higher prices? No, I think not. The main reasons why they cannot feed cattle is because the feed is not available. The cattle population has increased, I believe, by 17,000,000 head. I think the number of hogs has increased almost 40 percent over the normal period. Chicken and sheep have also increased greatly in numbers. Total animals for feed have increased to such an extent as a result of favorable prices that the food necessary to feed the cattle and the sheep and all the other animals is not available. To my way of thinking that is the main reason why we do not have as many feeders now as we had in the past.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. While it is true that the Price Stabilizer states that there is a shortage of corn, I think the Senator will agree with me, because he has attended all the hearings I have attended, that the problem that is confronting us more particularly is the price of cattle, and if corn commanded a good price it would be turned loose and we would get the corn necessary to feed the live animals.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will admit that, to a certain extent, but, as the record shows, the corn growers in Iowa and other corn States find it more profitable to feed corn to hogs than they do to feed it to cattle; and so the hog producers keep the corn for themselves and are unwilling to let it go to the cattle growers. And if the price of corn is raised, the cost of feeding cattle and sheep and hogs and chickens, and the cost of dairy products, will all rise further, and there will be still more pressure for higher prices.

Mr. WHERRY. What is actually being done is that the Price Stabilizer is holding the price of corn down to such a point that the corn farmer is not selling. I agree that that is one of the reasons why more cattle are not being fed; but there is still the unfavorable ratio—that is what the cattle feeders testify to—as being the prime reason why they are not replacing cattle in the feed lots. All of them say if the Price Stabilizer would rescind the \$16 ceiling and go back to the Little Steel formula under which they were entitled to \$17.80 a hundred f. o. b. Chicago for AA prime beef, the cattle feeders would fill their feed lots; they could get the corn to feed the cattle and would be glad to produce meat for this country.

If the Senator will yield further, he says they increase production; I say they decrease production. I think if we would take the ceiling off many farmers would put cattle back on the feed lots, and there would be more poundage; but they are not satisfied. The way to get the price down is by creating a surplus, not a scarcity. We need all that can be produced in order to keep down inflation, but the longer we maintain a program of scarcity by offering a subsidy, it will take that much longer for a price adjustment to be made on a supply and demand basis, and in the meantime we will have to buy the beef at a higher price, and force purchasers into the black market, unless we are permitted to go ahead and produce a surplus. I do not believe the subsidy has increased production of meat and if production is not increased how does the Senator suppose the inflation of meat prices will be held down? That is the point I should like to have the Senator answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I tried to answer that suggestion in my prepared remarks. I am convinced that the payment of subsidies has nothing to do with the growing of more cattle or less cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. If there had not been a subsidy would a price of \$16 a hundred been placed on live animals at Chicago?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no reason in the world why not. The \$16 average top for prime beef is considered a fair price, and it does not matter whether part of this comes out of a subsidy paid the packers or not. The subsidy has nothing to do with the matter. It should be remarked, however, that the Senator's method of increasing the production of cattle is by raising the price.

Mr. WHERRY. No; by increasing the number of pounds of beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the raising of the price means increasing the cost of living.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; I would rather have the poundage of meat.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can the Senator say that, when the ceiling price today is \$16 and he wants \$17.80? If that would not increase the price of beef to the consumer, I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will bear with me for one more observation, my contention is that by producing a surplus the price is controlled both downward and upward. The only way to do it is to do it on the profit motive basis without any restriction and without any subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means then that if more cattle are produced in the future they will be sold for less than \$17.80 a hundred? Perhaps for as little as \$16?

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what is happening with the unfinished cattle, and that is the kind of cattle we are getting today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just indicated that one of the reasons, to my way of thinking, why more cattle are not being fed today is the increased population of cattle, hogs, sheep, and everything else that consumes feed, and the limited amount of feed available.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no increased poundage of cattle in this country; but beef calves and meat cows are simply being placed on the market at \$6 a hundred—

Mr. AIKEN. That is the top price.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that is the top price of the unfinished cattle people today are buying for beef, but under the subsidy program corn-fed beef is not going to the beef counters; the unfinished product is being sold there; and unless subsidies are taken off it will not be possible to control the prices, and the consumers will get beef from the black market.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say that many cattle buyers take advantage of the farmers in cattle-producing States, as they do in my own State, in regard to farm products. There is no reason why the farmer should sell for 6 cents, because the range of prices for the various grades of cattle as fixed by the stabilization program is as follows:

Choice, \$15 to \$16 per hundredweight.  
Good, \$14.25 to \$15.25 per hundredweight.

Medium, \$12 to \$13 per hundredweight.  
Common, \$10 to \$11 per hundredweight.



Cutter and canner, \$7.25 to \$8.25 per hundredweight.

Bologna bulls and stags—equivalent cutter and canner—\$8.50 to \$9.50 per hundredweight.

None of these prices are as low as \$6. Mr. WHERRY. Are they Chicago prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. They may be Chicago prices, but the cost of freight is not so great as to absorb as much as \$3 per hundredweight.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator that at the hearings which were attended by some 200 cattlemen they unanimously agreed that they had not received the subsidy of \$1.10 a hundred.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not intended that they should receive it.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes, it was. It was intended to keep up the price to the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; that is what it was intended for; but, as I pointed out a while ago, the trouble was that many of the cattle growers held back their cattle for better prices and got caught when the very high prices of this spring did not hold up.

Mr. AIKEN. The trouble is that the buyers have got the cattle growers in a tight place and are depressing the price to them all over the country. They take the cattle to Chicago and the people read what they get in Chicago for it, but that does not represent at all what the farmer gets. Furthermore the buyer has to sign an agreement that he will turn the subsidy over to the man from whom he buys the cattle.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that was true, it has been remedied, for the rules and regulations have been changed.

Mr. AIKEN. How long ago were they changed?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were changed 3 weeks ago.

Mr. AIKEN. The cattle producers are certainly not getting the subsidy now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unless the processor can show that he has paid to the farmer the support price he does not get the subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. A processor does not buy from the farmer; he buys from a beef dealer, and one dealer buys from another. The processor has to pay the subsidy to the dealer he buys from, and the dealer does not pay it to anybody unless he sees fit to do so.

The Senator from Louisiana will recall that the representative of the meat-packing industry who testified before the committee was asked if the meat packers had not maintained their own purchasing agencies to whom they paid the subsidy, and he said "Yes." All the 200 cattlemen there said they did not get the subsidy.

The subsidy roll-back program on meats, as put into effect, was supposed to reduce the price of meat to the consumer. It has done that scarcely at all, except on the high-price cuts such as porterhouse and tenderloin. The sub-

sidy was to hold up the price to the farmer but has not done so. Apparently, some middleman has kept the subsidy. It would appear that they have gotten together and agreed to depress the price to the farmer. Beef cows in the Northeast sold for 10 cents a pound when this program went into effect, but our top ceiling price today is 6 cents a pound, and that reduction has not been passed on to the consumer. The program has been an absolute failure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that average retail meat prices fell by almost 10 percent when the subsidy went into effect and have stayed down since. Of course, the Senator is citing quite a few instances. What he states may have occurred, but I farmed for 22 or 23 years, and I know what these produce buyers do in order to keep the price of my commodities down. I presume the same thing has occurred with a few of the farmers who were present and who testified sometime ago. They are taken advantage of by these leeches in business, as I call them.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes practically all the dairy farms in the northeastern part of the country, some of them, even in the State of Connecticut, where it costs them so much to keep cows that they have no market whatsoever for a dry cow. They have to sell a dry cow for beef in order to get some salvage out of her before they can purchase new cows and produce milk.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question. I should like to get through.

Mr. WHERRY. This is in the form of a question. I will ask the Senator whether he heard the testimony of the man who testified, to whom the junior Senator from Vermont referred—

Mr. ELLENDER. What was his name?

Mr. WHERRY. Judge Montague, who testified that the processors were paying the subsidies to the producers. Judge Montague testified in connection with all these prices that were paid, that the packer stated, on a check or in a letter, that this included the subsidy that was allowed, and under the rule under which it was allowed, the price fixed in the directive, \$16, includes the subsidy—that is, what the producer has to accept in full payment for the cattle purchased from the feeder.

The Senator read, in stating the prices at Chicago, that on prime beef there should be a range of \$15 to \$16 a hundred. As a practical farmer, the Senator knows that very few cattle sales are made at the top price, so that in reality this beef about which I spoke, the prime beef, seldom sold at \$16. I doubt if the average price paid in Chicago is even \$15.50 a hundred, and that includes the subsidy of \$1.10 per hundred.

I should like to make an observation, because I know the Senator is sincere in the presentation of his figures by which he attempts to prove his position on the subsidy program. I want to give him some practical figures.

In September, before this directive went into effect, we sold AA prime beef on the Omaha market, which is around 75 cents a hundred under Chicago because of freight rates, at \$15.75 a hundred. After this order went into effect the same kind of steers, out of the same lot, fed a month longer, brought \$1.50 less.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would explain how in the world the subsidy program can affect that price.

Mr. WHERRY. If I understood the Senator's remarks, the subsidy program increased production and did not decrease the farmer's price. Here is a subsidy program that is supposed to result in a subsidy being paid to the cattle producer, but which has decreased the price.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator is talking about prices.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator says cattle sold for a certain amount before the program went into effect.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And afterward the price went down.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the Senator explain how the subsidy program could do that.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to answer that. It is because the subsidy program cut out the direct farm-to-market trade, which had a tendency to hold up the price to the farmer and to hold down the price to the consumer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means the method of selling cattle was changed?

Mr. AIKEN. The subsidy is not paid to any processor who dresses and sells less than 4,000 pounds of meat a month. That cut out probably hundreds of thousands of farmers who dress meat and sell direct to the consumer, and forced them to sell through the packing houses. Nine big packing houses handle about 70 percent of all the meat sold in this country, and the subsidy program forced all the small producers to market through the packing houses, which were thus enabled to get together, if they so chose—and it looks as if they did—and decrease the price to the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount of beef that is taken over by the small processors who process less than 4,000 pounds per month is not a drop in the bucket, and I do not see how on God's green earth it could affect the prices to which the Senator from Nebraska refers. The Senator from Nebraska gave as an example the sale of cattle of the same kind on the same market.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have him tell me, or to have the Senator from Vermont tell me, how the subsidy program could have affected those sales.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator how it affected them. Under the program a subsidy of \$1.10 is supposed to be paid in addition to the price the commission men pay the cattle feeders.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no. I have indicated on several occasions that the processor gets the subsidy, provided he reduces the ceiling prices of beef to consumers and provided further, under the new regulations, that he pay the support prices to farmers for the cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Did he hear the question propounded to O. P. Wilson, secretary of Meat Producers' Association, as to whether they paid the subsidy to the farmer, and his affirmative answer?

Mr. ELLENDER. At that time there was no ceiling on live cattle and the livestock could have sold for as much as the processor desired to pay for it. If he wanted to lose money on it, he could have done so.

Mr. WHERRY. To which time is the Senator referring?

Mr. ELLENDER. The time to which the Senator is referring in the example he gave.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me restate it; I do not believe the Senator understood me. The cattle which sold prior to the directive on October 26 brought \$15.75 a hundred. The same kind of cattle brought \$16.50 a hundred before June 15. The 10-cent roll-back that was supposed to be paid to the consumer, if it was paid, did not go back to the producer. The Senator knows that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. After October 26 there still was no subsidy paid to the producer, because a \$16 top was placed on cattle, which automatically reduced the price of the cattle \$1.50 a hundred; the subsidy of \$1.10 was not paid to the cattle feeder. Here is a case where the price stabilizer has certainly not put on a price, fair according to the Little Steel formula, nor has he gotten increased production. By a subsidy, meant for the producer, but paid instead as a roll-back to consumer. It has decreased production, because cattle are not going out of the feed lot that ordinarily should, and it certainly has decreased prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact the new beef cattle program does not go into effect until December 15. I do not believe the Senator and I can agree on that proposition because he shifts from production to prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Both are involved. Prices are controlled by production.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot for the life of me see how the subsidy program has in any wise affected the price of cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator believe that production is based on prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they not comparable? If there is a lower price, will we get increased production?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not discussing that phase with the Senator. The point is that the purpose of the subsidy was to do what?

Mr. WHERRY. To increase production.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the subsidy was to guarantee to the producer, in a measure, that both the retail price of meat would be reduced, and the price for his livestock would be kept up.

Mr. WHERRY. Did he get the subsidy?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, he did not get the subsidy. It was paid to the processor, but the processor rolled back the meat price, I think, by \$1.10 a hundred, and the subsidy made that up to the processor. In any case the rules and regulations have now been amended so that in order for a processor to obtain the subsidy he must show that he paid the producer—that is, the cattleman—the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us not argue any more, because, with all due respect, I think that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska in a way mixes up the price structure with production.

Mr. WHERRY. It should be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the schedule of market prices the Senator just read I think he quoted the cutter and canner beef, and bologna bulls. Did he have any prices of feeders?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know whether those would be included in this category. This directive merely gives the grade of the cattle, and then the support prices of them, and they are designated as choice, good, medium, common, cutter and canner, bologna bulls, and tags.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It does not give any price on feeders?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it does not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Without the price on feeders being given I fail to see how the Senator can arrive at any decision as to the value in connection with what he is talking about. The Senator is talking about the producer and the marketing price. The producer has very little to do with the marketing price. The producer sells his cattle to a feeder through the market as a rule, and that feeder must be assured of a differential of at least 3 cents a pound to enable him to sell on the market and stay in business. I believe the Senator has missed the importance of the feeder operation in the production of beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may have, I will say to the Senator. I know that the distinguished Senator is a very eminent cattle grower in his State. For instance, the price fluctuation on good cattle—I do not know the designations—but the difference is \$14.25 to \$15.25. That is f. o. b. Chicago.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is merely a grade, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. How much should a steer ordinarily sell for on the farm so as to make it possible that the feeder would make a fair profit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. At least 3 cents more than he paid for it when he purchased it from the stock grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words if the feeder buys a medium steer—and here are the prices between \$12 and \$13—he would have to pay for that steer on the farm from \$9 to \$10.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. And if he pays 12 to 14 cents, as he has to today, then he has to get from 15 to 17 cents on the market in order to break even.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I recall hearing the testimony of one witness who was a producer of cattle, who said that if he could sell a feeder for from 9 to 10 cents f. o. b. farm he could make plenty of money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. He can?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And I think that these prices about reflect that figure.

Mr. President, the beef program has now been revised so as to insure the objective of supporting the price of cattle as well as the maintenance of the cost-of-living line. Packers are now required to pay specified minimum prices for given grades of cattle to qualify for the full subsidy payment. If, over a period of time, they fail to pay these minimum prices for the cattle they buy, corresponding reductions are made in their subsidy payments. In this way the cattle producer is now reasonably assured the cattle prices which the subsidy program makes possible. If it is desired to guarantee absolutely that the prices of cattle do not fall below any given level, the only thing to do is have the W. F. A. or the C. C. C. promise to buy all offerings at that level. Removing the subsidy will do nothing to insure that the price of cattle will not fall when supplies glut the overworked slaughterers.

A more complete treatment of the beef subsidy program as related to beef prices is set forth in exhibit D, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, exhibit D was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BEEF SUBSIDY AND CATTLE PRICES

In addition to the fact that nothing in the beef subsidy program could logically have any tendency toward reduction of cattle prices, beef cattle price statistics show no relationship between the introduction of the subsidy and the decline of the prices of choice and Good beef cattle which has taken place since the spring of the year.

Beef cattle prices reached their peak in early April, 3 weeks before there was any discussion whatever of the beef subsidy. (See table II.) By April 30, when the Price Administrator announced by radio that retail prices of meats and butter would be rolled back by payment of a subsidy, prices of Choice beef cattle had already fallen by 72 cents per hundredweight to \$16.72 for the week ending May 1 from their peak of \$17.45 for the week of April 10. During the following 6 weeks, before the roll-back and subsidy became effective, prices continued to ease slightly, the average price of Choice beef cattle being \$16.48 for the week ending June 12. On June 14 the roll-back went into effect at the processor level. From then through the week of September 25, while prices fluctuated considerably, there was a net decline of only 14 cents per hundredweight, the price of Choice beef cattle averaging \$16.30 for the week ending September 25. Average monthly prices averaged lowest in July at \$15.98 and jumped back to \$16.24 in September. During the 2½ months of operation of the subsidy, in other words, Choice beef prices held practically at their level at the time of the introduction of the plan. The average monthly price for September was only 11 cents per hundredweight below that of June, in which the subsidy



was introduced. (See table I.) The prices of Good beef cattle showed rather similar trends during the periods discussed above. The price behavior indicates that the subsidy permitted and even encouraged maintenance of prices despite an extraordinary rise in the numbers coming to markets between April and May and the later months. (See table III.)

Behavior of prices of Medium and Common grade cattle, which are usually purchased primarily for feeder purposes, show a different movement, an almost steady decline from the high levels in early April through the end of October. From the week of April 10 to the week of October 30 the price of Medium steers fell by \$2.87 and the price of Common grade steers by \$3.60. This behavior, when viewed in relation to the substantial steadiness of Good and Choice varieties, is clearly indicative of the growing feed shortage, aggravated by the record high level of animal numbers created by the very favorable prices for Good, Choice, and Prime varieties throughout the last year and the winter and spring months of this year. To induce purchase of this feeder cattle in the face of the unfavorable feed conditions required a sharp drop in prices. No doubt this drop in prices is also in part responsible for the slightly weak undertone of Choice and Good prices during the summer and fall.

Against these forces making for lower cattle prices—abnormally large numbers, shortage of feed, and a very heavy run of cattle to slaughter—the favorable position which most slaughterers enjoyed as a result of the subsidy payments was insufficient to maintain choice and good grade prices at their full previous highs. Competition among sellers was such as to bring the price down despite the fact that slaughterers could, under the price regulations and with the aid of the subsidy, have paid somewhat higher prices. It was for this reason that it was decided to buttress the subsidy program with the minimum support mechanism embodied in the new program recently announced.

The new program provides an effective technique by which the subsidy funds will hold up the level of live prices. By imposing upon the packer a loss of subsidy funds whenever prices fall below floor levels, it has been made reasonably certain that prices will be held above those levels. Subsidy funds will, therefore, not accrue to the advantage of the packer.

The floor arrangement has other very great advantages. It will provide a sound basis upon which the operation of the grower and feeder can go forward. It will provide a steady market, the advantages of which are, of course, general. Without a floor any fall in prices is likely to stampede the market. With a floor, on the other hand, any fall in prices toward that floor creates a situation in which prices are much more likely to rise than they are to fall further. The grower or feeder will, therefore, hold back cattle as prices approach the floor, thereby strengthening the market.

TABLE I.—Prices per hundredweight of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter

(Monthly averages, 1943)				
	Choice	Good	Medium	Common
January.....	\$16.05	\$15.05	\$13.65	\$11.79
February.....	16.44	15.53	14.11	12.36
March.....	16.98	15.92	14.61	12.91
April.....	16.96	15.91	14.70	13.12
May.....	16.58	15.59	14.31	12.70
June.....	16.35	15.50	14.35	12.78
July.....	15.98	15.06	13.78	12.12
August.....	16.13	15.29	13.87	11.69
September.....	16.24	15.27	13.58	10.99
October.....	16.05	14.92	12.58	10.37

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, Nov. 9, 1943.

TABLE II.—Average price of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter

(Dollars per 100 pounds)					
Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
1943					
Jan. 2.....	15.89	14.90	13.47	11.29	14.03
Jan. 9.....	16.10	15.00	13.65	11.62	14.86
Jan. 16.....	15.63	14.88	13.46	11.80	14.75
Jan. 23.....	16.08	15.17	13.77	11.89	14.87
Jan. 30.....	16.11	15.12	13.75	11.88	14.91
Feb. 6.....	16.24	15.33	13.95	12.14	15.00
Feb. 13.....	16.45	15.55	14.15	12.34	15.17
Feb. 20.....	16.60	15.69	14.27	12.67	15.27
Feb. 27.....	16.69	15.51	14.03	12.20	15.12
Mar. 6.....	16.92	15.77	14.46	12.77	15.29
Mar. 13.....	16.94	15.99	14.68	12.92	15.50
Mar. 20.....	16.85	15.70	14.51	12.88	15.67
Mar. 27.....	17.11	16.01	14.66	12.88	15.67
Apr. 3.....	17.18	16.13	14.89	13.22	15.79
Apr. 10.....	17.45	16.11	15.01	13.59	15.83
Apr. 17.....	17.25	16.02	14.69	12.77	15.73
Apr. 24.....	16.88	15.81	14.49	12.81	15.71
May 1.....	16.72	15.73	14.46	12.69	15.61
May 8.....	16.60	15.56	14.28	12.75	15.37
May 15.....	16.46	15.54	14.30	12.74	15.42
May 22.....	16.63	15.56	14.18	12.39	15.44
May 29.....	16.67	15.67	14.44	12.89	15.51
June 5.....	16.61	15.63	14.51	12.62	15.64
June 12.....	16.48	15.62	14.46	13.06	15.56
June 19.....	16.14	15.19	14.02	12.74	15.31
June 26.....	16.48	15.60	14.37	12.85	15.77
July 3.....	16.20	15.34	14.26	12.43	15.53
July 10.....	16.18	15.30	13.95	12.27	15.53
July 17.....	15.90	14.97	13.72	12.41	15.25
July 24.....	15.91	14.88	13.70	12.13	15.26
July 31.....	16.01	15.10	13.77	11.75	15.52
Aug. 7.....	16.19	15.29	13.92	11.83	15.38
Aug. 14.....	16.26	15.51	13.93	11.81	15.35
Aug. 21.....	16.65	15.16	13.62	11.61	15.28
Aug. 28.....	16.07	15.20	13.87	11.58	15.42
Sept. 4.....	16.14	15.29	13.93	11.34	15.35
Sept. 11.....	16.23	15.39	13.74	11.27	15.43
Sept. 18.....	16.32	15.42	13.87	11.35	15.65
Sept. 25.....	16.30	15.25	13.36	11.19	15.40
Oct. 2.....	16.14	14.93	12.88	10.42	15.28
Oct. 9.....	16.15	15.02	12.82	10.54	15.61
Oct. 16.....	16.04	15.00	12.98	10.74	15.38
Oct. 23.....	16.15	14.90	12.51	10.79	15.20
Oct. 30.....	15.89	14.81	12.14	9.99	15.09

Source: Livestock, Meats, and Wool Market Review and Statistics published by F. D. A.

TABLE III.—Number of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter

Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
1943					
Jan. 2.....	5,433	9,238	3,664	135	18,470
Jan. 9.....	4,309	9,707	5,438	386	19,840
Jan. 16.....	5,996	9,204	6,033	379	21,072
Jan. 23.....	3,499	11,444	7,177	340	22,460
Jan. 30.....	4,430	8,437	6,229	357	19,453
Feb. 6.....	3,808	8,292	6,998	686	19,784
Feb. 13.....	3,183	9,830	8,104	422	21,539
Feb. 20.....	2,105	10,654	7,341	574	20,674
Feb. 27.....	1,698	8,321	5,989	268	16,276
Mar. 6.....	1,947	7,151	8,203	504	17,805
Mar. 13.....	2,056	7,563	8,327	417	18,363
Mar. 20.....	3,304	9,825	7,248	480	20,857
Mar. 27.....	2,202	10,700	7,548	308	20,758
Apr. 3.....	2,692	8,975	6,959	372	18,998
Apr. 10.....	1,687	9,468	6,275	679	17,999
Apr. 17.....	1,753	8,064	5,141	836	15,794
Apr. 24.....	3,728	9,335	4,989	122	18,244
May 1.....	4,765	11,107	6,204	362	22,438
May 8.....	3,668	10,917	6,707	478	22,070
May 15.....	4,058	13,066	5,850	205	23,209
May 22.....	2,254	15,048	3,726	218	21,246
May 29.....	2,952	14,467	5,940	226	23,585
June 5.....	2,678	10,038	2,577	99	15,392
June 12.....	3,648	17,629	4,589	139	26,305
June 19.....	5,052	10,362	2,459	228	18,101
June 26.....	5,287	7,989	1,926	146	15,348
July 3.....	6,520	8,938	2,265	227	17,950
July 10.....	6,369	8,182	1,589	137	16,277
July 17.....	9,508	11,475	2,428	180	23,591
July 24.....	10,465	7,945	2,434	538	21,382
July 31.....	8,228	9,760	2,789	196	20,973
Aug. 7.....	7,557	11,223	3,342	505	22,627
Aug. 14.....	5,151	11,231	4,674	304	21,360
Aug. 21.....	7,305	8,944	2,899	269	19,417
Aug. 28.....	9,135	8,790	2,863	208	20,996
Sept. 4.....	7,740	10,847	4,138	262	22,987
Sept. 11.....	6,842	9,311	3,112	233	19,498
Sept. 18.....	10,394	10,205	2,813	222	23,634
Sept. 25.....	8,214	9,523	2,588	544	20,869

TABLE III.—Continued

Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
Oct. 2.....	9,198	8,347	1,433	672	19,650
Oct. 9.....	11,122	7,917	542	144	19,725
Oct. 16.....	9,471	6,826	1,445	310	18,052
Oct. 23.....	7,565	7,847	1,432	563	17,437
Oct. 30.....	12,021	10,975	1,401	985	25,380

Source: Livestock, Meats and Wool Market Review and Statistics published by Food Distribution Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would now like to discuss the consumer's stake in the stabilization program, of which the subsidy program, as I have shown, is a vital element. There is no question but that the savings to the consumers of the Nation are far in excess of the cost of the program. As I indicated a while ago, if the consumers of the Nation were to pay for their goods and services during this war on the same basis as they had to pay during World War No. 1, the additional cost to them, conservatively figured, would be \$22,000,000,000.

One of the methods by which costs to the consumers can be restrained is by preventing pyramiding through the distributive system, by means of reducing prices at the early stages of distribution by a subsidy payment, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks. For instance, take a commodity like canned snap beans, or in fact any canned vegetable where support prices for the raw product are necessary to sustain production. Canners sell their product to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a price which reflects the support price fixed by W. F. A., and then the Commodity Credit Corporation sells this commodity back to the canners at a lower price, from whence it is sold through the regulated to be inflated by the higher prices lower than those which reflect the amount paid for the commodity by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The mark-up for the middleman is not permitted to be inflated by the higher prices growers receive for their canning crops, and in that way the consumers benefit.

Another form of direct saving for consumers is secured by not having to raise the price of whole supplies to get products from remote sources, as is the case with transportation subsidies, commonly known as freight equalization payments.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a short exhibit as follows:

CONSUMER SAVINGS PER DOLLAR OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON SUBSIDY

For each dollar spent by the Government, consumers save in lower prices:

Sugar.....	\$2.30
Petroleum.....	3.85
Apples.....	8.50

If the subsidies were eliminated today, the following would happen immediately, as was pointed out by Judge Vinson some time ago: Each loaf of bread would cost at least a penny more; each pound of butter at least 5 cents more; the cost of a quart of milk would rise at least 1 cent; each pound of bacon, cut of beef, pork chop, ham, and every ounce of ham

sausage would advance at least 10 percent; each can of vegetables would advance at least 25 percent; each pound of cheese would advance at least 4 cents; each pound of sugar will go up 1 cent; each pound of potatoes will go up from 2 to 3 cents; prices will also advance on prunes, raisins, peanut butter, upon which the agencies of government have programs under way or contemplate transportation or other subsidies to obtain stable and uniform prices. In short, the cost of food as a whole would rise more than 7 percent, and the cost of living as a whole would rise by about 3 percent, before any repercussions are considered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator said the price of bread would go up. About how much does the Senator anticipate the price of bread would go up?

Mr. ELLENDER. About 1 cent. Of course, the increased cost to the baker would be about one-half cent, but, as a rule, the price does not go up a half cent on a loaf of bread. It would go up a cent.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that if the price of wheat goes up to parity—and that means about 9 or 10 cents a bushel more—that that will mean a half-cent increase to the baker?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should it?

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, there is today a price squeeze between the price of wheat, what the millers have to pay for it, and what they have to sell the flour for.

Mr. AIKEN. How can anyone blame the farmer for that price squeeze? If the Senator will inquire at the Bureau of Agricultural Economics he will find that the farmer gets about 2 cents for his share out of a loaf of bread, so what justification is there in raising the price of bread 1 cent or 2 cents when all the farmer gets out of it anyway is just 2 cents? There is no justification for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator received any complaints from any bakers at home or from any millers at home?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will find that the increased cost is due to other causes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may have his own opinion, but I think I am entitled to mine. The millers are crying that the rising price of wheat squeezes them, and the higher price of that wheat goes back to the farmer. The bakers claim they cannot absorb higher flour costs. They may be wrong, but I could not say that they are.

The question arises, could consumers easily absorb this increase? I would say that many could. You and I probably could, Mr. President. But a vast number could not. Only a small part of our

working population have received the wage increases which some workers in our war plants have enjoyed. For many, rising wages have not offset the present rise in living costs. For example, the percentage change in average hourly real earnings between January 1941 and May 1943 for different nonagricultural laboring groups, which is computed by deflating the increase in average hourly money earnings during that period by the rise in the cost of living, is as follows:

	Percent
All nonagricultural establishments.....	-1.0
Manufacturing.....	12.4
Durable goods.....	13.0
Nondurable goods.....	5.0
Nonmanufacturing.....	-9.3
Mining.....	-0.1
Construction.....	-5.4
Transportation and public utilities.....	-9.3
Trade.....	-1.5
Government.....	-21.0
Finance, services and miscellaneous.....	-5.1

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be incorporated the table entitled "Money and Real Average Hourly Earnings, by Major Nonagricultural Industry Groups, for Selected Dates."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 14.—Money and real average hourly earnings, by major nonagricultural industry groups, for selected dates

MONEY															
Industry group	Amount					Percentage change from—									
	August 1939	January 1941	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	August 1939 to—				January 1941 to—			May 1942 to—		September 1942 to May 1943
						January 1941	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	September 1942	May 1943	
All nonagricultural establishments.....	\$0.660	\$0.699	\$0.785	\$0.811	\$0.859	5.9	18.9	22.9	30.2	12.3	16.0	22.9	3.3	9.4	15.9
Manufacturing.....	.624	.683	.835	.892	.953	9.5	33.8	42.9	52.7	22.3	30.6	39.5	6.8	14.1	6.8
Durable goods.....	.688	.749	.925	.997	1.050	8.9	34.4	44.9	52.6	23.5	33.1	40.2	7.8	13.5	5.3
Nondurable goods.....	.576	.610	.712	.743	.796	5.9	23.6	29.0	38.2	16.7	21.8	30.5	4.4	11.8	7.1
Nonmanufacturing.....	.675	.706	.756	.763	.795	4.6	12.0	13.0	17.8	7.1	8.1	12.6	0.9	5.2	4.2
Mining.....	.833	.848	.988	1.004	1.052	1.8	18.6	20.5	26.3	16.5	18.4	24.1	1.6	6.5	4.8
Construction.....	.892	.945	1.050	1.067	1.110	5.9	17.7	19.6	24.4	11.1	12.9	17.5	1.6	5.7	4.0
Transportation and public utilities.....	.742	.765	.838	.846	.863	3.1	12.9	14.0	16.3	9.5	10.6	12.8	1.0	3.0	2.0
Trade.....	.600	.606	.678	.690	.741	1.0	13.0	16.0	23.5	11.9	14.9	22.3	2.7	9.3	6.5
Government.....	.671	.732	.700	.684	.718	9.1	4.3	1.9	7.0	-4.4	-6.6	-1.9	-2.3	2.6	5.0
Finance, service, and miscellaneous.....	.652	.685	.716	.725	.807	5.1	9.8	11.2	23.8	4.5	5.8	17.8	1.3	12.7	11.3
REAL <sup>2</sup>															
All nonagricultural establishments.....	\$0.660	\$0.684	\$0.668	\$0.679	\$0.677	3.6	1.2	2.9	2.6	-2.3	-0.7	-1.0	1.6	1.3	-0.3
Manufacturing.....	.624	.668	.710	.746	.751	7.1	13.8	19.6	20.4	6.3	11.7	12.4	5.1	5.8	0.7
Durable goods.....	.688	.733	.787	.834	.828	6.5	14.4	21.2	20.3	7.4	13.8	13.0	6.0	5.2	-7
Nondurable goods.....	.576	.597	.605	.622	.627	3.6	5.0	8.0	8.9	1.3	4.2	5.0	2.8	3.6	8
Nonmanufacturing.....	.675	.691	.643	.638	.627	2.4	-4.8	-5.5	-7.1	-6.9	-7.7	-9.3	-8	-2.5	-1.7
Mining.....	.833	.830	.840	.840	.829	-4	.8	.8	-5	1.2	1.2	-1	0	-1.3	-1.3
Construction.....	.892	.925	.893	.893	.875	3.7	.1	.1	-1.9	-3.5	-3.5	-5.4	0	-2.0	-2.0
Transportation and public utilities.....	.742	.750	.713	.708	.680	1.1	-3.9	-4.6	-8.4	-4.9	-5.6	-9.3	-7	-4.6	-4.0
Trade.....	.600	.593	.577	.582	.584	-1.2	-3.8	-3.0	-2.7	-2.7	-1.9	-1.5	.9	1.2	.3
Government.....	.671	.716	.595	.572	.566	6.7	-11.3	-14.8	-15.6	-16.9	-20.1	-21.0	-3.9	-4.9	-1.0
Finance, services and miscellaneous.....	.652	.670	.609	.607	.636	2.8	-6.6	-6.9	-2.5	-9.1	-9.4	-5.1	-3	4.4	4.8

<sup>1</sup> According to the National War Labor Board, the increase in basic wage rates authorized by the Board during this period amounted to 0.4 percent in manufacturing and 0.2 percent in other private nonagricultural employment. Other adjustments authorized by the Board, such as shift bonuses, incentive-pay plans and vacations with pay, resulted in additional increases in rates of 0.4 percent in manufacturing and 0.2 percent in other private nonagricultural employment. It is clear therefore that most of the increases in basic wage rate earnings was due to factors other than increases in basic wage rates. The most important of these are increased overtime pay and the relatively greater expansion of the employment in the high-wage industries.

<sup>2</sup> Money earnings deflated by the cost-of-living index as developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (August 1939=100).

Source: Office of Price Administration series based on data obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, and other agencies.



Mr. ELLENDER. Now let us take the fixed income groups, who have already suffered heavily. Conservatively, these total 14,000,000 recipients, not counting their dependents, and not counting the low-paid white-collar workers in industry, and those who live on interest, mortgages, and royalties. These fourteen millions include two and nine-tenths millions who receive public assistance, three and two-tenths millions who are school teachers and State and local government workers, almost five millions who depend on military allotments, about one million dependent on veterans' pensions, and others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Recipients of Fixed Incomes, by Type of Payment."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Recipients of fixed income, by type of payment<sup>1</sup>*

Type of payment	Number of recipients (millions) <sup>2</sup>
<b>A. Public assistance.....</b>	<b>2.94</b>
1. Old age assistance.....	2.17
2. Aid to dependent children.....	.31
3. Aid to the blind.....	.08
4. General relief.....	.38
<b>B. Government salaries.....</b>	<b>4.58</b>
1. Federal (excluding military) <sup>3</sup> .....	1.34
2. State and local (excluding public education).....	1.92
3. Public education.....	1.32
<b>C. Military allotments<sup>4</sup>.....</b>	<b>4.75</b>
<b>D. Veterans' pensions.....</b>	<b>.86</b>
<b>E. Old age and survivors' insurance.....</b>	<b>.69</b>
1. Lump sum payments.....	.61
2. Monthly payments <sup>5</sup> .....	.68
<b>F. Railroad retirement<sup>6</sup>.....</b>	<b>.16</b>
<b>G. Civil service pensions<sup>7</sup>.....</b>	<b>.07</b>
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>14.05</b>

<sup>1</sup> Excluding interest, rents, and military pay; exclusive also of life insurance payments, which are not available.

<sup>2</sup> Only recipients are indicated. Reliable data on the total number of persons dependent upon fixed incomes (i. e., recipients and their dependents) are not available. It may be conservatively estimated that at least one-fourth of the total population are in this category. In addition, it is estimated by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor that approximately 6,000,000 workers are currently receiving wages of less than 40 cents an hour.

<sup>3</sup> May 1943.

<sup>4</sup> Represents total civilian employees exclusive of Army and Navy employees connected with an industrial activity. These total 1.78 million and include some salaried employees; the figure shown here is therefore an understatement of the number of Government salaries.

<sup>5</sup> Latest monthly data.

<sup>6</sup> Army, October 1943; Navy, August 1943.

Sources: Public assistance and old age and survivors' insurance: Social Security Board; Veterans' pensions: Veterans' Bureau; Federal employment and Civil Service retirement benefits: U. S. Civil Service Commission; State and local government employment: Bureau of Census; Public education: Constants used by Bureau of Census; Military allotments: War and Navy Departments; Railroad retirement: Monthly Review of Railroad Retirement Board—Includes retirement operations and lump-sum death benefits.

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research Oct. 9, 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let us now turn again to the Government's stake in the food-subsidy program—that is, to the taxpayer's stake. I believe that the subsidy payments can best be viewed

as an insurance premium to protect the taxpayer against immense losses. To grasp the magnitude of this stake, it is necessary to keep only two facts in mind:

First, that the Government—that is, the taxpayer—buys for war purposes about 50 percent of the total output of the economy. This means that the Government pays, directly or indirectly, about one-half of the cost of all materials and of all labor, right through the whole production and distribution system.

Second, keep in mind that one price rise begets others; that rising prices beget wage increases; that one wage increase begets others, and that wage increases raise prices to the Government, as well as to others.

These are the two reasons why subsidies are very cheap insurance, from the standpoint of the taxpayer. The indirect effect of the estimated 3 percent rise in cost of living, were the subsidies to be removed, would be to cost our Government, the taxpayers, billions of dollars. Since wages are sensitive to a rise in the cost of living, there would be little that could be done to prevent wage increases; and for every dollar of wage increase, 50 percent of it would have to be borne by the taxpayers.

Even if wages rise only eight-tenths of 1 percent for each 1 percent rise in living costs, which is very conservative, and assuming that prices moved up by only the amount—not the percentage—which this increased wage cost would add to total costs of doing business, the Government's war costs would increase by at least \$2,000,000,000 within a year, as a result of this 3 percent rise in living costs. This is the initial—only the initial—cost which would be entailed by the elimination of these food subsidies which cost the Government only about \$800,000,000.

The above calculations, of course, follow the inflation spiral only a very short distance. We all know how the spiral grows on itself once it is well started. If it really gets going, the cost to the taxpayer will be tremendously higher than already indicated. If subsidies are removed and inflation sets in, I would not be at all surprised if our war costs would double next year, or over the few years to come in which this conflict may last. In other words, if our war cost is \$100,000,000,000 for this year, it may grow to as much as \$200,000,000,000 next year, or the year after, should the dam break. It is amounts of this magnitude with which we are dealing when we question whether it is wise to spend a few hundred millions to hold back the tremendous inflationary forces which are now pent up in our economy.

There is no use fooling ourselves that labor will be satisfied with a mere 3 percent rise in order to offset the removal of subsidies. Some say it would be simple and harmless to withdraw the food subsidies and give compensating increases in wages. Since withdrawal of the subsidy would raise the cost of living by 3 percent, they argue, an increase in wage rates of only 3 percent would be sufficient, and the anti-inflation program would not be broken.

Mr. President, this contention is based on two main fallacies:

First, it overlooks the fact that the cost of living, even with the subsidies, is more than 5 percent above the level at which it was to be stabilized under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and approximately 7 percent above the level of May 1942, the stabilization base under the Little Steel wage formula. The removal of the food subsidies would raise the cost of living to 8.4 percent above the September 15, 1942, level and 10.1 percent above the level of May 1942. It is this substantial rise in living costs which has been primarily responsible for the difficulties on the wage front since the Stabilization Act was passed. Workers are not going to be satisfied with a 3-percent wage increase which simply offsets a further rise in living costs of 3 percent, especially since the removal of the subsidies at this time would indicate pretty clearly that the price stabilization line was being abandoned and that workers must therefore take care to protect themselves against future cost of living advances.

The second fallacy arises from the common failure to consider the repercussions of rising wages upon prices, and of further rising prices upon wages. If general wage levels are increased by even 3 percent, price ceilings on a number of important cost-of-living commodities will have to be raised. Rising industrial wages will also tend further to raise wages of agricultural labor, and put more pressure on food prices. The additional purchasing power created by higher wages will add its pressure to the inflationary tendencies. Hence prices will rise again, wages will again have to be readjusted, and the inflationary spiral will be under way.

No, Mr. President; the proposed solution of the inflationary problem is naive and illusory. The only way to avert the inflationary spiral, which will end in disaster for farmers as well as for others, is to hold the cost of living where it is, and continue to work with all our strength to hold it there, if not lower. This can only be done if the food subsidies are retained.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the true and real friends of the farmers of our country should be for the subsidy program. What the subsidy program does, essentially, is to give the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator freedom to make sure that farmers' food prices are adequate, without plunging them into the wild—and losing—gamble inflation is. I contend that prices to the farmers will not necessarily be any higher if subsidies are removed. They might even be lower, for the subsidies permit higher prices to be fixed for raw agricultural products, without upsetting retail price ceilings. Is it not to the advantage of the farmers of the country that their prices be so fixed that they can make reasonable profits without disturbing the whole fabric of our society? As I indicated earlier in my remarks, inflation would destroy our ability to produce, both in war

and for the post-war period. I contend that it would also destroy the free enterprise system. Better a little regulation now than dictatorial regimentation after our free economy has been shot to pieces by inflation and deflation.

Let us look at the farmer's interests more directly, in dollars-and-cents terms. Is there any question in the mind of any Senator present that if our stabilization program would come to an end the cost of what the farmer buys will not rise, will not skyrocket? I am sure that they would, because as I have indicated a bit ago, the prices of the materials which the farmers need on the farm as a rule keep pace with—and sometimes more than keep pace with—the prices which the farmers receive for their products. The fact that prices farmers pay have been held down so much below prices they are receiving for their products constitutes a large part of the explanation of the present favorable position of the farmers. The farmers' friends should protect this position, by fortifying, and not destroying, the stabilization program.

On the other hand, Senators, we have heard the plight in which the farmers of our Nation have been with respect to labor and labor costs. All of them have complained to us of the increased cost of labor. Farm wages will be pulled much higher than they now are if industrial wages rise further, as they certainly will if the cost of living rises. Of that there can be no doubt.

Let us look to the post-war period, Mr. President. If inflation sets in, our war debts will be crushing after the inflation has run its course and deflation ensues. All of us will suffer, but particularly the tillers of the soil, as they did after the last war.

If inflation comes and deflation follows, as it will, the prices farmers pay for goods and services will not fall as much as farm prices will fall. The last war shows how "sticky" industrial prices are after inflation has burned itself out, whereas farm prices fall quickly and much more sharply. For the welfare of the farmers the thing to do is to hold the retail price line, so that industrial prices and wages will not skyrocket.

In short, Mr. President, the whole country will lose by the elimination of the subsidy program; but the farmers themselves, taking the long view, have more to lose than any other group, except possibly the dependents of soldiers and the recipients of public assistance. I earnestly urge each and every Member of this body, and particularly the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, who will consider H. R. 3477, to give this problem their most serious consideration. I plead with members of the Committee on Banking and Currency not to permit the elimination of subsidies unless a better plan can be presented by them. For the future of America as we have known it, inflation must be stopped at all costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not wish to disturb the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in making his final remarks on subsidies; but in order to clarify the record I wish to refer him to the hearing which was held on November 15 before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On page 50 of the transcript of the hearing I asked Joe G. Montague, general counsel of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, of Fort Worth, Tex., this question:

Senator WHERRY. Judge Montague, would you say that the subsidy is getting back to the producers?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; it is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, Judge Montague is a big lawyer from Texas. I doubt if he knows much about cattle raising, because when I tried to examine him he would not answer any questions. He tried to interrogate me.

Mr. WHERRY. I also inquired of Frank S. Boice, president of the American Live Stock Association, who is a cattleman and rancher. He owns thousands of acres of land and many cattle. I asked him the same question. He gave the same answer. I asked the same question of Mr. P. O. Wilson, secretary of the National Live Stock Producers' Association. I believe he is the meat man whom the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was quoting a few moments ago.

Mr. AIKEN. No; he is a representative of the livestock marketing association. I was referring to the representative of the packers' association.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked him the same question, and he said that the \$16 price was the outside price that could be paid unless the packer took it out of his own pocket. That testimony is found at page 91 of the transcript.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is under the last ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked Mr. Wilson the following question:

Senator WHERRY. In other words, there is no chance for the producer to get anything out of the packer at all above the \$16 a hundred? Is that right?

Mr. WILSON. No; the packers could pay more than \$16.

Senator WHERRY. But, if he does, he takes it either out of his pocket or the Government says they take it out of the subsidy, but the subsidy goes to the consumer as a roll-back.

Mr. WILSON. If he pays more than \$16, not on one load but the average purchases—

Senator WHERRY (interposing). For the month.

Mr. WILSON. For the month, on double A cattle he loses that much off of his subsidy. He loses the amount that he goes over the \$16 outside of the subsidy. If he pays under \$15, he loses that much out of his subsidy. But don't forget, gentlemen, if he pays under \$15, he loses the subsidy but he gains in price by buying lower than the \$15 price.

Senator WHERRY. In other words, he uses the subsidy proposition to beat down the cattleman, in order to make his sales average \$16.

Mr. WILSON. Exactly.

Senator WHERRY. And that applies to both cattle and hogs?

Mr. WILSON. Both cattle and hogs, and sheep.

That has reference to the question I asked, as to whether or not they ever paid more than the \$16 top. He said that the packers use the \$16 tops to beat down the price, so that the cattle producer, instead of getting \$16, receives as little as \$14 for double A beef today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not arguing with the Senator. I think he believes what he is saying, but I simply cannot agree with him. I asked every witness who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I was present the specific question, If you do not want stabilization, what is the remedy? The answer was "Higher prices."

I warn the Senate today that if we do have higher prices for cattle it will mean higher prices for every commodity consumed by the American people; and once the dam is "busted" we cannot possibly stop inflation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The dam has already been "busted" in connection with some of the salaries being paid, has it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a doubt as to that.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the wages of miners? There is no question about them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is arguable. I am not thoroughly familiar with that question. However, let me say this to the Senator: If the President had abided by what John L. Lewis desired when he first started his fight for a wage increase—that is, an additional \$2 a day for the same number of hours—it would have broken the Little Steel formula. As I understand, the miners must work 48 hours a week to receive \$54 pay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. They were given an increase of \$1.50 a day. The only difference is the difference between \$2 and \$1.50.

Mr. ELLENDER. That \$1.50 is for overtime for an additional hour worked at \$1 an hour. They are entitled to it under the law; but their basic wage has not been increased.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator seems to take the position that I am interested in the testimony of Mr. Montague, general counsel of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, because he is not a cattleman. I have referred to Mr. Boice. I wish to refer to the testimony of Mr. Wayland Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, president of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association. He is a farmer with 3 sons in the service. He testified that he had been a cattle feeder for years. He had been forced to reduce his feeding operations to practically a third. He made this statement about the corn situation.

Senator WHERRY. If corn goes up in price, which is anticipated, and cattle remain at the ceiling of \$16 in Chicago, do you feel



there will be more beef produced or less beef produced between now and next June?

Mr. HOPLEY. Senator, we are having a tough time getting something to eat now. The Lord only knows what will happen if that goes into effect.

Senator WHERRY. Referring to this lot of cattle that you sold for \$15.40 and \$16.50, have you marketed any cattle in the last 18 months of the same quality, and did they bring a higher price? What did they bring? Do you remember?

Mr. HOPLEY. I might be off a little bit; but, as I remember it, they brought around \$17.30 or \$17.40.

Senator WHERRY. Was that Chicago?

Mr. HOPLEY. That was Chicago. All the prices I have quoted are on the Chicago basis.

Senator WHERRY. So the same class of cattle at one time after this price law went into effect brought \$17.35 or \$17.40 a hundred, but you have since taken \$15.40?

Mr. HOPLEY. In my particular case it might be greater, if you take into consideration that I had this load of cattle that brought the top price. I took my best cattle off first.

In other words, the feeding ratio is too narrow. Mr. Hopley says that it would not make any difference if the ceiling on corn were lifted, because they had to have a probable market in order to increase the supply of beef. That statement, coming from a producer who has been feeding for nearly 50 years, ought to be convincing evidence that the way to cut down inflation is to get a surplus, and the way to get a surplus is to cut out the subsidy and go to the profit-motive basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I fail to see that the way to keep down prices is to let prices keep on going up. In answer to a question, Mr. Hopley replied, as I recall, that it was less profitable to feed cattle with corn, and more profitable to feed it to hogs. As I further recall, Mr. Hopley stated that one of the chief reasons why there are not more cattle fed today than in the past is the feed shortage, which has caused the price of feed to go up. The Senator remembers that testimony, does he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I remember very distinctly that the witness—

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only Mr. Hopley—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. He testified that the reason for decreased cattle-feeding operations was that the feeding ratio was too narrow, and that, regardless of where the ceiling on corn was placed, or the abundance of corn, there would be no difference unless the feeding ratio were broadened. That is the point I am making. Under the subsidy program we now have, with the \$16 top, we have absolutely driven replacement cattle out of the feed lots. The program has not increased production. It will not increase production. Instead of a meat surplus we shall have a scarcity. Inside 6 months the meat problem will be so acute that there will be a famine of double A prime beef on the meat counters of this country. Instead of retarding inflation, it will promote it. Instead of driving prices down, it will drive them up. We want to get a surplus of meat in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator a while ago, the way he would remedy the situation would be to allow the price of cattle to rise. Is that true?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the prices reestablished, as the witness, Mr. Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, has asked, on the basis of the Little Steel formula as of September 15, 1942, when prime beef cattle were bringing at Chicago \$17.80 a hundred. If we would do that, instead of operating under the subsidy roll-back plan, then we would get replacement cattle back into the feeder yards.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that were done, how would it affect the price ceilings?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think it would affect the retail prices at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about the squeeze on the processors?

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the things which must be worked out by the Food Administrator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator think it can be made profitable?

Mr. WHERRY. I know that if the sources of supply are cut off it will not make any difference what happens to the processor. The processor then will not have any meat to process or sell.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply desire to say in behalf of the cattle raisers in the eastern part of the United States that I think they would be very happy if they received a price anywhere near the ceiling price set by the O. P. A. today. I do not know the situation west of the Mississippi River, but in the East, where cattle raisers receive from 4 to 6 cents a pound, I think they would be very happy to receive prices anywhere near the ceiling price. That is the situation today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator attributes all the blame for the low price to subsidies; does he?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I attribute it to this: When the subsidy and the roll-back program were put into effect, it forced cattle to be rendered through certain processing channels. If the farmer has two or three or four beef cattle to sell today, he cannot say he will sell them merely because the rules and regulations allow him to do so, and he certainly will not get the \$1.10 subsidy if he does sell them.

#### WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Butler
Austin	Brooks	Byrd
Barkley	Burton	Capper
Bilbo	Bushfield	Caraway

Chavez	Lucas	Smith
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Stewart
Danaher	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Gillette	Mead	Truman
Green	Millikin	Tunnell
Hatch	Moore	Tydings
Hawkes	Murray	Vandenberg
Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Hill	Overton	Wagner
Holman	Pepper	Wallgren
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb	Wherry
Kilgore	Robertson	White
Langer	Scrugham	Wiley
Lodge	Shipstead	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, because the Appropriations Committee and other committees are in session and, therefore, only a small number of Senators are present, suggestion has been made with respect to having the vote go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask what the statement of the Senator from Illinois was?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois was about to agree to have the Senate go over until tomorrow in view of the fact that so few Senators are present. It is now past 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. We have arrived at the voting stage on this particular amendment. Can we not dispose of it and then go over until tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. It will be all right to have a yea-and-nay vote. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALLGREN (when Mr. BONE's name was called). The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent, convalescing from an illness. It is my understanding that if present he would vote "nay" on the pending amendment.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote "nay." I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would if present vote "yea." Therefore I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas (Mr. REED). I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah (Mr. MURDOCK), and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is

out of the city in connection with business of the Senate. On this vote he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If present, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Pennsylvania, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. Brewster] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Gurney] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Buck] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Taft] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] is confined to his home with a cold.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Glass] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Bailey] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. Andrews], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'Mahoney], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Reynolds] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. George], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Chandler], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], the Senator from California [Mr. Downey], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Guffey], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Gerry] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'Daniel] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Murdock] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead] has a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 33, as follows:

## YEAS—33

Alken	Davis	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Robertson
Bridges	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	White
Chavez	Moore	Wiley
Danaher	Nye	Wilson

## NAYS—33

Barkley	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Green	Kilgore
Caraway	Hatch	Lucas
Clark, Idaho	Hayden	McFarland
Eastland	Hill	McKellar

Maloney	Radcliffe	Truman
Maybank	Scruggam	Tunnell
Mead	Smith	Van Nuys
Murray	Stewart	Wagner
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Walsh

## NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Downey	Murdock
Bailey	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	George	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gerry	Reed
Bone	Glass	Reynolds
Brewster	Guffey	Russell
Buck	Gurney	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Willis
Connally	McNary	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the able Senator from Illinois in connection with the particular point upon which we have just so closely divided.

In spite of the fact that the able Senator believes that the war ballot commission would have no substantial policy responsibility, the fact remains that it is generally recognized that the war ballot commission would be the root source of the entire program for collecting perhaps eight or nine million votes, which might control the next Presidential election.

It has been very frankly—and I think with extreme fairness—recognized across the aisle that the two Republican members of the commission should be satisfactory to the Republican side of the Senate. That is no reflection on the President of the United States, or his appointive power, or the method in which he would exercise it. It is merely a frank recognition of the fact that elections are partisan, and that partisan divisions should be fairly and effectively protected when elections are held.

In view of the fact that the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Green], and the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch], and I think one or two others, assured the Senator from Vermont a day or two ago that if any Republican commissioner were nominated by the President who was unsatisfactory to the Republican side of the Chamber they would join in rejecting his nomination, it seems to me that we are in complete agreement regarding the propriety of protecting the character of these minority appointments.

Therefore I am going to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he would object to amending section 101 on page 16, at line 21, so that when the Senate advises and consents to these nominees two-thirds of the Senators present shall be required for confirmation, so that we may have in the text of the law the assurance of the protection, in respect of these particular nominees, which has been offered to us informally and unofficially by the distinguished Senators in charge of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator propose that as an amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I am proposing in line 21, after the word "Senate" to add the words "provided two-thirds of

the Senators present concur," which is the language of the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I earnestly ask the Senator from Illinois to accept that amendment? I hope he will. I think that should be done by all means, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois agrees to that I should like to propound an inquiry to both Senators. Of course, that proposal is not in harmony with the constitutional provision that the Senate may confirm Presidential appointments by a majority vote. Is it the Senator's contention that we have a legislative right to go beyond the constitutional requirement, and to require that two-thirds vote must be had for confirmation of all officers nominated by the President?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is certainly no constitutional provision that I know of against requiring any sort of formula that affects us with respect to our function.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true, but it might be subject to a possible exception, and—I now simply use the Senator's familiar language—I am exploring the thing for the purpose of satisfying my own mind. Suppose that in any case an appointee received the constitutional majority of the Senate vote; without regard to the fact that we had in the law said he must receive a two-thirds majority, would he have a right to insist upon his confirmation under the Constitution, so as to be entitled to the appointment regardless of any legislative requirement we might insist upon for a two-thirds majority?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I decline even to attempt to pose as a constitutional authority, Mr. President, but I am unable to believe that the situation which the Senator describes could arise.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises this question: Have we any more right by legislation to increase the number of Senators required by the Constitution for confirmation of Presidential appointees, than we have to reduce the number? Of course, we cannot by legislation provide that where two-thirds of the Senate is required, action can be taken by a majority. The question is whether we can actually change the constitutional provision with respect to confirmation, which says that a majority vote can confirm appointments by the President, by requiring a two-thirds vote, because under the Constitution any appointee receiving a majority vote would be entitled to the office, regardless of our legislative requirement for a two-thirds majority. I think that that is something which appeals perhaps to the legalistic mind, but it is a matter which may trouble us if we are not sure of the results.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a few moments ago when the vote was taken on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges], I was necessarily absent on official business. I



therefore move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if we must have another vote on that question because of the absence of one Senator, it may turn out that many Senators who are absent perhaps would like to have voted on the question. If there is to be another vote on the question I think it ought not to be had at this moment. The Senator can enter his motion, but I should like to have the vote postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is pending. The motion made by the Senator from Indiana may be entered, but it cannot be acted upon at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan in respect to the amendment he has offered, that it is a novel proposal, to say the least, and I should like to have it go over until tomorrow in order that some of us may give it a little more consideration before we make any agreement of the kind suggested by the Senator. It does not change my position, which I took when I started, with respect to clothing the ballot commission with all the confidence that is necessary from the standpoint of the American public. I want that confidence, as every other Senator wants it. At the same time I want to look into the proposal in view of what the able majority leader has said with respect to the question involving the Constitution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to speak upon that point for a moment I wish to read from section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which covers the point raised by the able majority leader:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

I call the able Senator's attention to the fact that while two-thirds majority is specifically provided with respect to treaties, no specific majority is required with respect to nominations, and I can see that it is wide open to the Senate's own jurisdiction.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may not be the proper interpretation. The Constitution made a very distinct difference between treaties and nominations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It requires two-thirds for the ratification of treaties, and of course by implication and by its terms requires only a majority for the confirmation of nominations by the President.

The point that I raise is whether we can by legislation require a larger majority of the Senate for confirmations than the Constitution itself requires, and whether if any appointee receives a constitutional majority he could insist upon his confirmation by the Senate under the terms of the Constitution, and whether we by legislation can require a larger number than the Constitution requires in the matter of appointments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the amendment offered to the bill have precedence over the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment does have precedence over a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. AIKEN. So long as an amendment can be kept pending then a motion to reconsider can be held off until it is too late to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; as soon as the amendment is out of the way and voted upon, then the motion to reconsider will be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose it is not out of the way for a couple of days?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is like any other question which is not disposed of for 2 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Chair somewhat anticipated what I was going to ask the Senator from Michigan. If the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is adopted, after reconsideration of the vote, I was wondering whether then the Senator from Michigan intended to press his amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding was that the Senator offered it only in the event the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I therefore suggest, if I may, that if the Senator from Michigan would withdraw his amendment, we would be in a position to vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, and if that amendment were rejected, the Senator from Michigan could offer his amendment again. Some of us are in the same position he is in. We would rather vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire first before passing on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am quite willing to withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear, in reference to the suggestion, that I desire that the vote be postponed until tomorrow, if we are to vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is a matter out of my jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator. If the Senate should adjourn this evening, would that put an end to the motion to reconsider?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, indeed; a motion to reconsider can be made at any time within 2 days; and when it is voted on, that is the end of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator from Michigan first made his suggestion I thought he wanted to have the members of the Commission confirmed in the usual way, after appointment, by a simple majority vote of the Senate. I am a great believer in the constitutional provision relative to Senate confirmation; and, as the Senator knows, I am the author of a bill, which the Senate passed some time ago, providing that all officers receiving salaries of \$4,500 or above shall be confirmed by the Senate. I think that it is a very wise thing to do. I thought that was what the Senator's amendment would do, until I went to his desk and read his amendment. I then found that the Senator's amendment would require a two-thirds majority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, that is the whole point. I am endeavoring to write into the law the assurance which has been given us, and which is perfectly satisfactory to me; and yet I think it should be textually in the act itself that we on this side of the aisle are to have a veto as to those who are to represent us on this all-important Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I can see that from the viewpoint of the Senator from Michigan that would be all right. From my viewpoint, I do not believe such a provision would be in accordance with the Constitution, and I will have to withdraw the statement I made a few moments ago; because if there is one earthly instrument of which I am in favor it is the Constitution of the United States. I want to live up to it, whether it is in accord with my views or whether it is not in accord with my views. So long as it is the Constitution of the United States I am under oath to support its provisions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say so, I deny totally that there is any collision between the amendment and the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may be correct; but, so far as I am concerned, I think there is a difference between his amendment and what he desires his amendment to provide.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I am one of the Senators who gave the Senator from Michigan assurance that we were perfectly willing to do anything we could do to

see to it that the minority party had representation which was truly representative of it. However, I am wondering—and I am not speaking of the Constitution—whether the Senate of the United States desires to establish the precedent, and wishes to write it into the law, that we are placing these election commissioners upon a basis which transcends in importance that of our Ambassadors, our Supreme Court justices, all the other members of our judiciary, and all the general officers of the Army and the Navy. Should we say that these particular officers are of such importance that they should be placed on a plane elevated above that of all others? How does that suggestion appeal to the Senator. So far as I am concerned, I will give the Senator my written assurance, but I doubt very much whether such a provision should be written into the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my answer to the Senator is that I quite agree that the provision is an unusual one, but it is equally an unusual situation with which we are dealing. We are dealing with perhaps 9,000,000 votes which may determine the next Presidential election in the United States, and may affect the history of this country for the next 50 years. All of us want those in the armed forces to have a maximum opportunity to register their preferences in the election. The only thing in the world which interests me is to be perfectly sure that the election is a totally fair one. If in the establishment of the United States war ballot commission the text were to read, "There is established a United States war ballot commission which shall be composed of four commissioners, who shall be appointed by the next Republican nominee for President," it would be absurd; and yet, as the situation stands today, since the bill reads "who shall be appointed by the President," it virtually reads that they shall be appointed by the next Democratic nominee for President. It is no reflection upon the President, and certainly I intend none, to call attention to what I believe is an anomalous situation as a result of the actual conditions we confront. It is for that reason that it seems to me there is no extreme to which we can go to be too sure that we have totally protected the wellsprings of this undertaking to poll the absentee soldiers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the reasons the Senator from Michigan has just given are the reasons which moved me to agree in the first instance, in the committee, to have Senate confirmation of these officials. I believe that to be the regular and constitutional way, and I believed it to be an ample method by which the minority party could protect itself, if any protection were needed. In addition to that, expressions were made on the floor of the Senate that we would join in the effort to make certain that the appointees would be satisfactory.

I desire to say to the Senator from Michigan that what he says about the 9,000,000 votes as possibly affecting the election of the President of the United States is true; but the officials I named

a moment ago affect every branch of Government, every branch of human endeavor in this country, the lives, liberties, and property of every citizen of the United States; and yet those officials are confirmed by majority vote of the Senate. I doubt whether we desire to establish the precedent of saying that these election commissioners are of higher rank and of greater importance than other constitutional officers. I doubt it very much.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to clear the track, I withdraw my amendment for the time being, so that the issue may rest squarely on the question of reconsideration.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the motion to reconsider is debatable, but I do not care to debate it. I prefer that the vote be taken tomorrow, rather than at this time; and I am going to take the liberty of requesting unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and then recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the vote taken now. I think we had better decide the issue.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. I was recognized by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had not yielded the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Pardon me.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator desires to make a speech, I shall yield the floor to him.

Mr. WILLIS. It will be very brief.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to call up the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator knows that the vote on the motion can be delayed. The motion is debatable. The Senator can force some of us to discuss his motion this afternoon, or he can agree to let the matter go over until tomorrow. The Senator rushed in, after the vote, and gave as his reason for moving to reconsider the fact that he was absent at the time when the vote was taken. Many other Senators were absent. The Senator from Indiana had a perfect right to make his motion. If one-third of the Senators were absent, and were not expecting the vote at this hour, I think, in fairness to other Senators, as well as to the Senator who has come into the Chamber and has made the motion to reconsider, that the vote should be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIS and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana, if I have the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to state to the majority leader that I gave as my reason the fact that I was necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; I am not questioning that.

Mr. WILLIS. And I gave it at a time when nearly all Senators were present.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator gave his reason, and I accepted it. Of course, I do. However, there are other Senators who were absent for the same reason and who have just as much right to be present and to vote as the Senator from Indiana had to rush in and make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WILLIS. Other Senators have the same right to vote at this time as I had to vote formerly, and I have the same right to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course; but other Senators may not have had the same notice the Senator from Indiana had, and they may not have had the opportunity to get here.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Indiana that the motion to reconsider does not automatically come up. A motion must be made in order to bring it before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take advantage of the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator, and I do not intend to let him take advantage of me if I can avoid it. I think it is perfectly fair at this late hour, in view of the suddenness of the motion, that the motion should go over until tomorrow.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. If the Senate wishes to vote that motion down, it can do so.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Austin	Hayden	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Scruggs
Barkley	Holman	Shipstead
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Wallgren
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.



The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Announcing my pair, and its transfer as on the previous vote, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If the Senator from Michigan were present, he would vote "nay," and I am advised the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. My colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 29, as follows:

## YEAS—43

Andrews  
Bankhead  
Barkley  
Bilbo  
Byrd  
Caraway  
Chavez  
Clark, Idaho  
Clark, Mo.  
Eastland  
Ellender  
George  
Gillette  
Green  
Hatch

Hayden  
Hill  
Johnson, Colo.  
Kilgore  
Lucas  
McCarran  
McClellan  
McFarland  
McKellar  
Maloney  
Murray  
O'Daniel  
O'Mahoney  
Overton  
Pepper

Radcliffe  
Scruggam  
Smith  
Stewart  
Thomas, Okla.  
Thomas, Utah  
Truman  
Tunnell  
Tydings  
Van Nuys  
Wagner  
Wallgren  
Walsh

## NAYS—29

Alken  
Austin  
Bridges  
Brooks  
Burton  
Bushfield  
Butler  
Capper  
Danaher  
Davis

Hawkes  
Holman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Langer  
Lodge  
Millikin  
Moore  
Nye  
Revercomb  
Robertson

Shipstead  
Thomas, Idaho  
Tobey  
Vandenberg  
Wherry  
White  
Wiley  
Willis  
Wilson

## NOT VOTING—23

Bailey  
Ball  
Bone  
Brewster  
Buck  
Chandler  
Connally  
Downey

Ferguson  
Gerry  
Glass  
Guffey  
Gurney  
La Follette  
McNary  
Maybank

Mead  
Murdock  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Russell  
Taft  
Wheeler

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Rufus E. Foster, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:  
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the

Army be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

## RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

The following named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Kenneth A. Haines, October 16, 1943.  
Vernon J. Forney, November 4, 1943. (Dr. Forney is now serving under temporary commission issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943.)

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

## APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## TO THE SIGNAL CORPS

Second Lt. Robert Elwood Kimball

## TO THE AIR CORPS

First Lt. Rufus Hardy Holloway  
First Lt. Channing Stowell, Jr.  
Second Lt. George Eugene Bostwick  
Second Lt. Jack Wesley Streton  
Second Lt. Isaac Owen Winfree

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

## TO BE COLONEL, COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

John Henry Cochran

## TO BE COLONEL, FIELD ARTILLERY

Carl Conrad Bank

## TO BE COLONELS, INFANTRY

Vernon Evans  
Roscoe Barnett Woodruff  
Lewis Clarke Davidson  
Harold William James

## TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Frank O'Driscoll Hunter  
Morrison Clay Stayer  
Frederick Lewis Anderson, Jr.  
Westside Torkel Larson  
Howard McCrum Snyder  
William Willis Eagles  
Spencer Ball Akin  
Robert McGowan Littlejohn  
William Edward Raab Covell

## TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr.  
William Albert Matheny  
James Albertus Bethea  
Charles Bertody Stone 3d  
Charles Wesley Sullivan  
Frank Dorn

Ray Tyson Maddocks  
 Charles Loomis Booth  
 John Fuller Davis  
 Eugene Harold Beebe  
 John Walton Lang  
 Wilbur Reece McReynolds  
 George McCoy, Jr.  
 Alden Rudyard Crawford  
 Willard Gordon Wyman  
 Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr.  
 Donald Frank Stace  
 Orval Ray Cook  
 Malcolm Fraser Lindsey  
 Charles Augustus French  
 Frank Dow Merrill  
 Carl Brown McDaniel  
 Leonard Henderson Sims  
 Ridgely Gaitther  
 Zim E. Lawhon  
 Charles Trovilia Myers  
 Thomas Jeffries Betts  
 Leon William Johnson  
 Theodore Leslie Futch  
 Frank Needham Roberts  
 James Wrathall Spry  
 Oliver Lincoln Haines  
 Paul Clarence Paschal  
 Samuel Egbert Anderson  
 Tristram Tupper  
 Kenneth Claiborne Royall

## POSTMASTERS

## KENTUCKY

Milton Tackett, Pikeville.

## OKLAHOMA

Hal Files, Talihina.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of life and love, we would wait and look unto Thee for direction. Down through the centuries, through the difficulties of this bewildering world, amid the blunderings of men, the multitudes have looked to Thee with audacious hopes. Thou art ever ready with earth's unlocked riches for all; O, may we come wondrously into the deepest ministries of Thy spirit.

Our assignment means service, self-denial, and devotion as exemplified by Him who gave all until there was nothing He had not given. Enable us to confront these days with voluntary self-abnegation of our individual rights, thus making our realm of service most glorious. Let us be deaf to the hoarse appeals of bias and personal claims in which there is not a shadow of reality. We pray that we may scorn the sins which tempt us and that our country may have unity not only in war, but also in peace and thus be an inspiration to those brave men and women who art writing the most gallant epic of history. Be unto us a voice that we cannot forget, an unseen companion and a breath of sweet fragrance against the storm. In this, the world's evil days, be Thou with our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, and give strength to all anxious hearts and expectant minds. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 26, 1943, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.  
 Department of Commerce.  
 Department of the Navy.  
 Department of War.  
 Federal Trade Commission.  
 Federal Security Agency.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include some excerpts from an analysis of the pending civil aviation bill made by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders today, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Dallas News on lend-lease and reverse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes,

after the disposition of business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Also, Mr. Speaker, after the other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include three letters received by me from the chamber of commerce at Glens Falls, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## "HAWG" HOCKS AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR CONGRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a little package mailed to me by one of my good constituents addressed:

"Hawg" hocks. For Congressman "Piggy" F. L. (Win the War) CRAWFORD.

Mr. Speaker, the campaign for mailing Congressmen hog hocks is promoted by another of a long line of ex-Government economists named Faught, of Detroit, and formerly a so-called information specialist for the War Food Administration.

Economist Faught apparently envisions himself as a modern Samson, using the inflation-scare propaganda to damage agriculture as the strong man of old set fire to the foxes to destroy the crops, and then he hopes to use hog hocks instead of the jawbone of an ass hoping to slay Michigan Representatives in Congress who voted against subsidies. Newspaper publicity indicates Faught is modeling his campaign after the "Bundles for Congress" drive.

Subsidies as proposed further hock our future, and perhaps Mr. Faught has picked an appropriate symbol.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Indianapolis Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks by including a letter that I have received, and the text of a resolution which I propose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
 There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, correspondents in foreign theaters of war and home newspaper commentators have been forecasting within the last 24 hours that the next move of the United Nations probably will be along psychologi-



cal lines to try to induce the suffering nationals of Axis-ridden countries to see the necessity of overthrowing their tyrannical rulers and joining in creating a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

This psychological effort which the commentators assert is in the immediate offing and which is heralded as an approaching event of the most portentous importance, may be the means of ending the war.

An expression now by the Congress of the United States, representing the people of America, might be of tremendous assistance in putting this psychological effort across to successful consummation.

This suggests the propriety and wisdom of adopting House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 which I have introduced to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations and expressing our sincere sympathy for all Nazi-ruled victims everywhere.

The State Department and the Office of War Information have both endorsed my resolution. For the State Department, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, advises that he concurs in the sense of the resolution. He says:

The resolution has been carefully read and I find no conflict with the foreign policy of this Government. It embodies the spirit of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the people of defeated countries and also reflects, I am convinced, the attitude of the great majority of American citizens toward the unfortunate Italian people.

The Office of War Information is anxious to secure the adoption of the resolution for propaganda use, believing it would be very valuable for psychological purposes.

The resolution has been pending in the House Foreign Affairs Committee since September 21. I hope that all Members of the House will take note of it and express their interest and approval to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I hope that Congress, which has a great responsibility to our people, as well as to the world will express the people's will in this matter. I appeal to Congress to adopt this resolution so that we as the representatives of the people of America may do our part toward bringing to a successful conclusion the war which is consuming in its flames the lives of many of our precious boys, breaking millions of hearts and drenching the world in blood.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 50 is as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of Fascist rule, and to downtrodden, oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the

Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support, by all reasonable and constitutional means, the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by two insertions on the civil aviation bill, in one instance by inserting a resolution, and in the other a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial that appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, November 28, 1943, by Edwin L. James.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a set of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Ottumwa, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from the Secretary of State on the circumstances pertaining to the shipment of certain rubber to Sweden; and, secondly, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article that appeared in a magazine of the South Dakota State Penitentiary, proposing a plan for the use of inmates of penitentiaries in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the regular business on the Speaker's table today and the special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the regular business on the Speaker's desk and the special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### O. P. A. AND THE CHURCH, BUSINESS, AND UNION ORGANIZERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point. I understand there is no legislative business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a reference to the Appendix of the RECORD of March 19, pages A1307-A1308, will show that union organizers living in Detroit seeking to compel men driving their own equipment, and others who did not own their own equipment but driving delivery trucks, all seeking to deliver milk to customers, including stores, in Port Huron, Mich., received almost unlimited gasoline to enable them to drive from Detroit to Port Huron and to, in Port Huron, follow milk trucks about the city. These so-called union organizers, some of whom had been convicted of various offenses, made a practice of following milk trucks about the city of Port Huron calling upon their customers to whom deliveries were made and endeavoring to intimidate them.

They called upon storekeepers and, it is reported, threatened to picket the stores if they continued to take milk from men who refused to pay tribute to the union.

Of the so-called union organizers, three were allocated gasoline sufficient to enable them to travel 3,000 miles per month. Several others received a sufficient allotment to travel 2,000 or 1,000 miles each.

You will find the figures set forth on page 3259 of the RECORD of April 10, 1943.

#### HOLLAND, MICH.

In Holland, Ottawa County, Mich., for many, many years members of the Harrington family maintained a coal business. The widow of one of the older Harrington's, Mrs. Austin Harrington, two of the sons, Harry and Carl, still maintain that business and prior to April 5 of this year they supplied about 80 percent of the industrial coal tonnage used in the city of Holland. The industrial plants to which they supplied coal were working, to a large extent, on Government war contracts.

Around about the first of April representatives of the teamsters union came in from Grand Rapids—some 20 miles away—and attempted to organize the Holland drivers. There was no dispute as to hours, wages, or working conditions and the drivers working for the Harringtons did not wish, in fact, they refused, to join the union. The union picketed the Harrington yard but they had no effect, the men still refused to join so the pickets transferred their activities to the industrial plants which purchased coal from the Harringtons.

They threatened to picket incoming material, the outgoing finished products, and so Harrington customers, many of them of long years' standing, quit purchasing coal of Harrington and Harringtons have lost the business.

Here is an illustration of how the "four freedoms" do not work in Holland, Ottawa County, Mich. Here is an illustration of how the President stands behind his political allies, refuses to permit legislation which would end sympathetic strikes, correct the abuses which are carried on under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and outlaw attempts to create monopolies.

Why, just why should Harrington's business be destroyed or damaged because free-born American citizens working for him, do not choose to pay racketeers from Grand Rapids, Mich., for the privilege of earning a livelihood? The hypocrisy, the complete insincerity of the administration, which is carrying on a war to, as it says, carry the "four freedoms" to every benighted people in the world, is demonstrated by these two incidents which can be multiplied thousands of times throughout the country.

The unions are collecting millions of dollars from men who do not want to pay, whose only desire is to work at the job which they have found, for the wages they can obtain under the conditions which satisfy them. Yet, the union politicians yell their heads off about the roll-back in the cost of living.

They might start the roll-back by ending the practice of levying tribute of around \$1 and \$1.50 a month on workers who want no truck with them. That \$12 to \$18 per year which every union man is compelled to pay in addition to his initiation fees and special assessments, would help out on the grocery bill.

Now, for a moment take a look at another side of the picture, these union organizers, so-called, have been getting all the gasoline they need, to drive from Grand Rapids to Holland, traveling at least 50 miles a day on a useless, unnecessary, destructive errand. They drive around town following loads of coal that leave the Harrington yard to make certain that it does not go to Holland industrial plants.

But when a minister of the Gospel wants gasoline to get to his people, or to preach a funeral sermon, or bring a parishioner to the cemetery, that is something else again.

In the Pontiac Daily Press of Friday, on the front page, I find a picture captioned "Gasless pastor and followers picket O. P. A. office." It shows a line of pickets protesting the denial of gasoline to their pastor.

Detroit papers carry similar information stating there are 50 pickets in the line. According to the press, the pastor, Rev. Dr. Leland L. Marion, represents one of the largest churches in Pontiac. He also represents other congregations in the State.

In July 1943, he claims he applied for gasoline and that under the rules he, as a minister, should have been issued a C book. A Mr. A. J. Diebel said to be the head of the Pontiac local O. P. A. office ruled that he was only entitled to a B book. Not satisfied, the minister called upon Diebel and reported that he was told "Your work, Dr. Marion, as pastor of a church is not fundamental to the war effort. I am not concerned about the

churches. I am concerned about getting gasoline for the men who work in shops. In 60 days there will be no gasoline for churches and similar enterprises, and the quicker the churches close up the better it will be anyway."

The pastor continued his efforts, going he says, seven times to the O. P. A. headquarters but so far he has been unable to even get a definite reply from the board or a conference with Diebel.

The pastor writes:

What has been the result of this red tape, arrogance, stupidity, and anti-Christian attitude on the part of the O. P. A.? Not only have I been deprived of my gasoline ration, but in order to bury the dead and preach the Gospel and call on the mothers of newborn babes and comfort the loved ones of wounded and killed men in the armed services, it has been necessary for me to violate the rules and accept the generosity of my parishioners as respects gasoline.

What a contrast. O. P. A. gives rationed gasoline to men who drive day after day in an effort to force those working in defense industries to pay tribute for the privilege of working therein. They drive hundreds of miles to take from the workingmen's pay checks dues to further their own activities, their own political ambitions, but when a minister asks for gasoline to hold Divine services, to attend the sick, to assist in burying the dead, his request is denied and he is told, according to his statement, that the quicker the churches close up, the better it will be anyway. What cheering news to the men on the battle front.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday and Friday next, upon the conclusion of the legislative business, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### THE PRICE OF COAL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of Economic Stabilization has just announced an increase in the price of coal. Of course, that increase was necessary following the increased wages that were recently approved for coal miners. Possibly these wage increases were justified. I do not claim to know, but I do know that the miners were receiving \$1 per hour before the increase and that even with 20-cent cotton the average cotton farmer is realizing only one-fifth that amount for his labor.

The truth is that the wages of agricultural workers were so much lower than the wages of any other workers that even a small daily increase has resulted in more than doubling the total cost of labor in farm production. You can no more make a crop without labor than you can dig coal without labor. Why should not the producer of food products be given the same treatment that is accorded the producers of coal? This

House has passed a bill to include farm labor in the calculation of parity. No one dares challenge the justice of this bill, but we are told that it is inflationary. What about the inflationary effect of the increased coal prices?

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are entitled to fair treatment. They ask no more, but insist that they be given the same treatment that is accorded to others.

JOHN W. PRESTON AND ANNETTE ABBOTT ADAMS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 2508, a bill for the relief of John W. Preston, and Annette Abbott Adams, be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' VOTING

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Communist Party has secured the assistance of Walter Winchell in trying to browbeat the Congress into taking the election machinery away from the various States.

Last night he tried to mislead the American people to believe that the bill we are offering as a substitute would prevent soldiers from voting by absentee ballots when, in fact, it would have the very opposite effect.

This morning's issue of PM, the up-town edition of the Communist Daily Worker, comes out and accuses the Republicans and southern Democrats of trying to deprive American soldiers of the right to vote; whereas what we are trying to do is to make it possible for them to vote and to retain the voting machinery in the hands of the various States.

My God, does the American soldier have to look to this Communist publication for protection against red-blooded Americans in Congress in their right to cast an honest ballot?

The men in our armed forces are not deceived by such "bunk." They want the election machinery retained in the hands of their respective States. That is one of the things they are fighting for and that is what we propose to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire whatever to enter into a debate between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and Mr. Winchell. I think each is equally able to care for himself, regardless of the possession of facts or otherwise. I would like to say however that so far as I am personally concerned, I would like to see the States handle the entire matter of soldiers' voting. Sev-



eral months have been spent, not only by myself, but by representatives of the War and Navy Departments in an effort to work out provisions whereby the men overseas will be permitted to exercise the God-given right to vote. We have not yet been able to work out any satisfactory solution which will permit them to fully exercise their right of suffrage.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I will yield if I have time later on. I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman from Mississippi and I would like to go right along down the line with him, but I would like to quote on that point an official communication from the War Department which will show the practical impossibility of the plan advocated by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Army alone is now carrying by air some 700,000 pieces of mail a day, in addition to some 620,000 V-mail letters a day (average figures based on a recent month).

Even with the use of air mail and air priority, the State absentee balloting procedure as provided by existing State laws would not allow any substantial number of votes cast by servicemen overseas to be counted in State primaries and elections.

It is not a question of desires on our part. It is a question of the physical impossibility of getting the State absentee ballots to the men in Guadalcanal, north Africa, and other places overseas.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You can get those ballots to the men in the service quicker under our bill, the Rankin-Eastland-McKellar-McClellan bill, than you can under the Lucas-Worley bill.

In addition, ours will take the ballots to cover State and county officials and bring them back without a Federal Commission interfering with them, and more servicemen would vote as a result. We would get more ballots to the soldiers and get them back quicker under the Rankin-Eastland resolution than you would under this long drawn-out 21-page document that they are trying to bring out here to turn the election machinery of the country over to a Federal commission.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement from the War Department relative to overseas balloting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Members may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD, if they desire today, as there is no legislative program.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY COL. ROBERT CUTLER BEFORE THE MEETING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS NOVEMBER 16, 1943

(Present: Messrs. WORLEY, RANKIN, MAN-ASCO, GIBSON, HOCH, LESINSKI, GAMBLE, LE-COMTE, ELLSWORTH, VURSELL, GAVIN.)

After the introduction of the joint report of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy November 13, 1943, on House Con-

current Resolution 49, which was read to the committee by the chairman, Colonel Cutler, in response to question from the chairman, stated (in behalf of the Army and Navy) as follows:

"The services' position in regard to the air-mail carriage proposed under title I of the Green-Lucas bill is that, in regard to one election, it may be possible, subject to military necessity, to bulk carry blank air-mail ballots to almost all servicemen and to bulk carry executed air-mail ballots back to the United States.

"Such an undertaking is entirely different from the air carriage of individual applications for State absentee ballots and individual State absentee ballots (a total of at least three separate carriages for each serviceman) in respect to 46 State primaries and a general election, held on more than 26 different dates over a period extending from April into November. The burden on air-mail facilities under this latter procedure would not only be three times as heavy but it would be diffused in an infinity of individual carriages spread over a long period of months. Such a burden could not be sustained by air-mail facilities.

"What makes the procedure proposed under title I of the Green-Lucas bill a reasonable possibility is that it involves one bulk carriage overseas at a time selected at the service's convenience, and one bulk carriage back to America. Any procedure more onerous than this would, for overseas carriage, if it involved any considerable volume, raise the greatest difficulties for the services and interfere with their primary duties.

"There is another difficulty with the State absentee balloting procedure under State laws now in effect. (The figures which I am using are, I believe, reliable, but owing to the great diversity of State laws, should be checked up to date). Seven States apparently do not permit absentee voting for Federal candidates in primaries. Three other States apparently permit absentee voting only if the absentee is within the United States (as to two of these States, only if the absentee is physically within the State itself). Eleven States apparently allow only 20 days or less between the date when an absentee voter's application may be formally received by the State officials and the date on which his executed ballot must be received back by the State officials. Thirty-three States apparently allow an interval of only 30 days or less. Some 14 of these States appear to require that a particular form of application for absentee ballot, furnished by the State, be used by the absentee voter and do not recognize as an adequate application the post card form of application provided by the Ramsay Act. Such States, on receiving such a post card, would send to the absentee, not the desired ballot, but merely a form of application to be made out and sent back by the absentee before the absentee ballot will be sent. And, in addition, many States which will formally receive the absentee's application an adequate number of days before the election, will not dispatch the ballot itself to the absentee (because the candidates will not be known and the ballot accordingly will not be printed) until a more limited number of days (in some instances 15 or less) before this election. All of these restrictions tend effectively to negative the possibility of servicemen outside the United States voting in State primaries and elections by use of the existing State absentee voting procedure.

"I have obtained information from the proper Army authorities as to the time of air-mail carriage from various points overseas, where considerable bodies of our troops are now located, to a central point in the United States (Springfield, Ill.). For obvious reasons, I cannot here state where these overseas points are. But I can give instances of

the respective time of carriage to illustrate the difficult problem involved. In stating these times of carriage, I am giving the average time of carriage based on a long period of experience. Obviously for one particular emergency carriage, weather and military conditions permitting, the time of carriage could very materially be shortened. I emphasize the words "one particular emergency carriage." Such a special short-time carriage could not practically be repeated at frequent intervals.

	Days
From an oversea point in the North American area to Springfield, Ill.....	6
From an oversea point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill.....	11
From an oversea point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill.....	13
From an oversea point in the Far East area (longest carriage) to Springfield, Ill.....	16

"I wish to repeat that the foregoing are average times of air-mail carriage, based on actual experience over a long period of time, and are the carriage times which are properly applicable in considering the individual carriage by air mail of State absentee ballot applications and ballots over a period of 6 to 7 months. These are not the carriage times to be considered in relation to one particular emergency carriage of ballots in bulk, where the carriage time could reasonably be halved or, under favorable conditions, be made even more short.

"It is to be remembered, however, that the State absentee balloting procedure involves at least three carriages for each serviceman (and in 14 States, apparently, 5 carriages). The minimum carriages involved are: The post-card application from the serviceman to the State; the blank ballot from the State to the serviceman; the executed ballot from the serviceman to the State. Relating this triple carriage to the times of carriage I have stated above in regard to four points overseas, and allowing four additional days for action by the servicemen and the State officials—which is certainly an irreducible minimum—the following carriage times, plus four added days, would be involved through use of the existing State absentee balloting procedure.

	Days
Overseas point in North American area..	22
Overseas point in European theater.....	37
Overseas point in Pacific theater.....	43
Overseas point in Far East area.....	52

"In such States as require the use of a particular State application form, and hence five carriages, the times stated would be increased by 40 percent at least.

"It should also be observed that, as regards any servicemen overseas, the only address available to a secretary of state will be the overseas serviceman's organization and A. P. O. number. For reasons of security, the Army cannot identify to any secretary of state the geographical location of an overseas A. P. O. number. Accordingly, a State forwarding to any serviceman overseas the State absentee ballot would have to assume that the longest carriage time (52 days, or in States where five carriages must be made, 73 days) may be applicable.

"Furthermore, it should be observed that air priority refers to priority in space on a regularly scheduled flight. That is, air priority means that material other than that given priority will be taken off the carrying plane to make room for the material having such priority. Air priority does not imply that the service can or will furnish special planes to carry priority material in some more expeditious time than the regular air-carriage schedules provide.

"The Army alone is now carrying by air some 700,000 pieces of mail a day, in addition

to some 620,000 V-mail letters a day (average figures based on a recent month).

"Even with the use of air mail and air priority, the State absentee balloting procedure, as provided by existing State laws, would not allow any substantial number of votes cast by servicemen overseas to be counted in State primaries and elections."

In answer to a suggestion that applications for State absentee ballot applications and State absentee ballots might be sent by the services direct to each serviceman, Colonel Cutler stated in substance as follows:

"The Army cannot, in view of its wartime responsibilities, undertake to furnish as of a given date or dates a roster, by States, of the names and military addresses of all men in the service.

"Such an undertaking would be precluded, in many cases, by the requirements of military security.

"Apart from security, it would not be practically possible under war conditions to make such a roster."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I have made, I may include certain excerpts from this bill, and also a table showing the flying hours between points in this country and points where our servicemen are situated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Richmond Banner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice, in one to insert an address by Charles E. Wilson and in the other to insert an address by Ralph Bard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION IN ORDER ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the House to consider

District of Columbia bills under the Rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the so-called Lucas-Worley bill which has been mentioned and also House Joint Resolution 190.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I secured this 30 minutes' time this afternoon for the purpose of provoking thought in an exchange of ideas among the Members of the House in an effort to find the best possible course the Congress should take in attempting to give the men and women of our armed forces an opportunity to vote in the November election of 1944, believing that it is the duty of this body so far as it lies within our power to try to legislate in a sound, practical, and legal manner to that end.

Mr. Speaker, being a Member of the Election Committee of the House, with others of my colleagues, I would like to say that we have spent many days hearing a great deal of testimony in an effort to determine whether the so-called Lucas-Worley bill is the proper and sound approach to this matter and whether it can be legally enacted into law to this end. I would like to further report to the Members of the House that after a great deal of painstaking care, and listening to testimony by all of the proponents of the bill, including testimony given by high ranking officials of the Army and Navy, a substantial majority of the committee believe the Lucas-Worley bill is not a sound, proper, and workable answer to this most difficult question. Finally being convinced that the bill referred to is not the proper approach to the subject, by a substantial majority, our committee has offered a different approach and are now perfecting House Joint Resolution 190, which, we believe, when further implemented, will provide a means for the soldiers to vote through the operation of the various State election laws through the absentee ballot systems now established in the various States, which will make it unnecessary to allow the Federal Government to step in establishing a Federal bureaucracy of election machinery as proposed in the Lucas-Worley bill. When we have perfected this resolution which is now before our committee, we believe that it offers the greatest opportunity, and the only opportunity, for the soldiers to make use of the ballot in deciding this election referred to without violating the Federal Constitution and in a manner that will obviate the necessity of violating any of the constitutions or laws of any of the several

States. We are confident that this second approach to the matter is sound and workable and will make it possible for the men and women of the armed forces to vote by the absentee-ballot method, vote the whole ticket with all of the names on it from the lowest office to the Presidential candidates, secretly, legally, with little or no opportunity for fraud or coercion.

First, I would like to point out what seems to me some of the important barriers to the enactment of the Lucas-Worley bill. Every Member of this House, in taking his oath of office, has sworn to uphold the Constitution. For my part, I want to live up to that oath—I intend to do so. There is little question but that the Lucas-Worley bill would violate the Constitution of the United States, usurp powers, and violate the Constitution and the laws of many of the States of the Union. If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where this bill is still under consideration in another body, and read the very able debates which have occurred there, you will find that even the proponents of the bill there appear to be not certain that the bill is constitutional. Further reading of the debates will disclose that many able Members of that body raise grave doubts as to its constitutionality.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. VURSELL. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It unquestionably violates or attempts to wipe out section 2, article I of the Constitution of the United States, the very first provision written into the Constitution relating to Government policy. It states:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That same provision was written into the seventeenth amendment 130 years later. All the great judges and statesmen we had during that time have agreed that it was a most salutary provision; yet the Lucas-Worley bill would wipe that provision out and not only set up a separate qualification, but would force us to go to the double expense of sending two separate ballots or deny to the soldiers the right to vote in State and county elections.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I have no desire to take all the gentleman's time arguing with the gentleman from Mississippi, but I would like to ask if he would object to having inserted at the beginning of his remarks a copy of the committee print which the committee has been considering, in conjunction with the original bill. Would the gentleman object to that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman



from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has permission to insert that in his own remarks.

Mr. WORLEY. I am asking for permission to put it in at the same point the gentleman puts his in so that a comparison can be made between the original bill and the draft which the committee is considering. That point of doing away with the necessity for registration and the payment of a poll tax are questions which were passed on by the last session of Congress and overwhelmingly agreed to; is not that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. But that crazy law has not been passed on by the courts. The chances are that the courts will throw it out, and then if this Worley-Lucas bill were attached to it, the soldiers might have no authority to vote by absentee ballot at all.

Mr. VURSELL. Replying to the request of the gentleman from Texas I may say that I prefer that he extend it in his own remarks because it does not fit into mine.

There has been testimony before our committee from Members of this body, and I refer particularly to our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], a former secretary of state of Wisconsin, who is very familiar with the State election laws of Wisconsin, who testified before our committee that it would be practically impossible for the State of Wisconsin to comply with the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That same view is held by Mr. Jordan, secretary of state of California, with reference to the application of the Lucas bill and its effect on the California election machinery.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Aside from the legal objections to the bill, our committee found most serious objections to the form of the ballot. Let us keep in mind that the purpose of this bill is to give the soldiers a right to vote and make their choice for Federal officials including the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. I think it will interest the Members of Congress to know that the ballot provided for under this bill does not contain the single name of a candidate.

I wonder just how much the men, who are fighting on the battle fronts of the world for the freedom of this country and who are expecting to receive a ballot from their home precinct and county, will be disappointed when they receive this abbreviated and anonymous sheet of paper wherein they are to express their choice for these offices and to their great surprise they will find that there is not a single name on the ballot. The bill provides that if you know who is running for President you may write in his name or, if you do not, you may signify your choice by writing in the name "Republican" or "Democrat" in the space where the name should be and which the soldier may not know. I ask you, is this an

intelligent approach to the question? Likewise, if he knows the name of the Senator of either party he shall write in the name if he chooses, or if he does not know who is running for Senator in his State, he indicates his party preference by writing in the name of "Republican" or "Democrat," and the vote is so counted for the Senator of his choice.

When it comes to voting for candidates for Congressmen at Large or for Members of the House of Representatives from the various congressional districts, if the soldier knows the name of the candidate for Congress he should write in the name—if he does not know the name his only chance to make a selection is to write in his party preference.

Clearly, this so-called ballot is not a real ballot in any sense of the word. Notwithstanding the sentimental boasts of some of its proponents of their desire to give the soldier an opportunity to vote, it may deceive the relatives and friends of the soldiers at home in their belief that the proponents of this bill are trying to give the soldiers a chance to vote the entire ballot and creates the false impression that we who oppose the measure and who are trying to get the whole ballot to the soldiers are opposed to the soldiers voting.

The proponents of the bill have not once told the public that it is really not a real ballot and that not a name of a candidate will be on the slip of paper sent to the soldier which they refer to as a ballot.

I want to ask the Members of this body, if, in their opinion, 1 soldier out of 10, unless he receives letters giving him the information from his folks at home, will know the name of the candidate for Congress from his district. A great many of the citizens at home at this coming election, unless they are familiarized with the name of the congressional candidate on the ballot would not remember the name so he could write it in. This being the case, how do you expect these young men and women, thousands of miles away from home who have been in the military service and out of the United States for a year or two to appreciate such a ballot and to be able to vote with sufficient knowledge to make a proper choice?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to show what this Worley bill the gentleman from Texas has talked so much about does. I call attention particularly to subparagraph (d) of section 117 which reads:

(d) In certifying the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President under section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., title 3, sec. 7a) the executive of each State shall also certify that there has been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title. If the executive of the State does not make such certification or if the United States War Ballots Commission certifies—

And this might be by a vote of 3 to 2—that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the

provisions of this title, the Senate and House of Representatives, acting separately, shall concurrently decide whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors in the State as to require such appointment to be treated as invalid.

In other words, it authorizes us to go ahead and set aside the election of any State in the Union if perchance it is contended that all of the orders of this Federal election commission have not been complied with.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has put his finger right on one of the objections to the bill I referred to previously.

Mr. WORLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. Again I apologize for taking up the gentleman's time, but in answer to that point, is it not a fact that the Congress has always assumed its right and power to pass upon the returns of any State so far as the election of Federal officials is concerned since the time of the Tilden-Hayes contest? There is no question but what the Congress has that power. That language in the bill is surplusage.

Mr. VURSELL. That is true. So far as I know, the gentleman's statement may be correct, but in this act we are setting up an opportunity for the Congress to declare this election null and void, or throwing it into the House of Representatives or into the Supreme Court.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that in the Hayes-Tilden contest it was decided that the Congress did not have the right to go behind the election returns. There were two sets of returns from the States of Louisiana and Florida and the question was which set of returns would be recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the majority of our committee has taken the position that with the cooperation of the Army and Navy to expedite and speed up the delivery of the ballots, with the proper cooperation of the States under existing laws—and in this connection I may say that doubtless several of the States will further implement their local elections laws in order to assure the soldier of an opportunity to vote—that under existing State laws with such cooperation we can send the soldier the ballot direct from his precinct, the whole ballot containing the names of all the candidates from the county officers to the President of the United States. It will be to him like a letter from home—it will give him a chance to help to make the democracy work that he is fighting to preserve—it will greatly encourage his morale.

On the other hand, being thousands of miles away from home and expecting to receive a ballot where he can vote for his friends and neighbors from his county, for his Congressman, and for his choice for President, if and when he does receive this blank and anonymous ballot, undoubtedly it will be a great disappointment to him.

Now in a few words let me tell you what we propose to do under House Joint Resolution 190. There has been prepared 11,000,000 post-card applications. During the past few months these post-card applications have been impounded on the various battle fronts of the world. Some 60 days prior to the election these post cards, under our plan, will be distributed to the men and women in the armed forces.

On one side of the post card is a request for an absentee ballot for the soldier to sign giving military address. On the other side is printed, "Secretary of State" with a blank space in which he shall write in the State in which he votes before mailing. These cards will be carried by air mail to the various secretaries of state of the several States. The secretary of state will immediately forward them to the various county clerks or election officials whose duty it is to send him an absentee ballot. In order to beat the time element the cards will be distributed on the battle fronts in time for them to reach their destination in the various precincts as early as the ballot is obtainable by the election official who will mail to him the ballot and enclose therewith an oath of qualification for the voter to sign, which oath of qualification is set out in our resolution.

The envelope carrying the ballot out to the soldier will have printed on the outside "Official election ballot." This will afford expeditious and free air-mail transportation to the soldier. After he has voted the ballot, signed and sworn to the qualification blank, he places them in the enclosed envelope upon the outside of which is printed "Official election ballot" for the purpose of designating that this official election ballot is entitled to air-mail service free, and it is returned to the county or city official, to be distributed to his precinct, where it will be counted on election day.

The only difficulty in the soldier making use of the absentee ballot voting laws of the States is the time element. You will note by our plan we reduce the time element by one-third with the postal-card application. We have left only one round trip from the precinct to the voter and back to the precinct. There are only 15 States in the Union whose primaries are held as late as September 15, with Louisiana and Utah early in October. All of the others are held from 2 to 4 months earlier, so you see these late primaries would give over 30 days in which to make this round trip with the ballot. In that connection, and to show you why we think it is possible to overcome this time element, I want to give you some figures which have been furnished me by the War Department, and these figures do not provide for speeding up the mail, but represent the average length of time to make such a round trip, even allowing the soldier 2 days in which to vote and the clerk 2 days in which to place the ballots with the proper precincts.

#### Location of soldier desiring to vote:

	Days
(a) Alaskan area:	
Nearest.....	14
Farthest.....	17
(b) Pacific area:	
Nearest.....	18
Farthest.....	30
(c) Canal Zone.....	13
(d) Caribbean area:	
Nearest.....	12
Farthest.....	16
(e) South Atlantic area:	
Nearest.....	14
Farthest.....	16
(f) Middle East area:	
Nearest.....	18
Farthest.....	20
(g) Persian Gulf area.....	22
(h) Far East area:	
Nearest.....	30
Farthest.....	46
(i) Mediterranean area:	
Nearest long haul.....	21
Nearest short haul.....	18
Farthest long haul.....	26
Farthest short haul.....	22
(j) North Atlantic area:	
Nearest.....	14
Farthest.....	24

Our resolution calls for the cooperation of the Army and the Navy in expediting the transportation of these ballots. Certainly they can cut these time limits, in some instances, to a considerable extent.

In this connection I want to give you a practical example of the speed with which air mail travels from Australia to the United States.

On Thanksgiving morning, November 25, I received this letter from Corp. George W. Emmett, from somewhere in Australia; on the outside of the envelope, which I hold in my hand, the postmark shows it passed through the Post Office in Australia on the 20th of November. Think of it—4 days by air mail from Australia to Washington, D. C. I am willing to admit that generally the time would likely be longer.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On that point, I consulted the Bureau of Civil Aeronautics and I was informed that they have a thumb rule to the effect that, counting all stops, commercial planes can travel to any of the principal points on the globe at the rate of 150 miles an hour. They sent me this table showing the number of hours it would take to go to different places:

To Fairbanks, Alaska, 13 hours; London, England, 13 hours and 48 minutes; Lima, Peru, 14 hours and 48 minutes; Rio de Janeiro, 19 hours; Moscow, Russia, 19 hours and 12 minutes; Honolulu, 20 hours and 12 minutes; Santiago, Chili, 21 hours; Buenos Aires, 21 hours and 36 minutes; Cairo, Egypt, 21 hours; Bombay, India, 32 hours; Cape Town, South Africa, 34 hours; Auckland New Zealand, 37 hours and 36 minutes; Manila, 37 hours plus; Sydney, Australia, 42 hours; Singapore, Malaya, 43 hours; Hong Kong, China, 44 hours.

That is under normal conditions. As a matter of fact, military planes fly much faster than do these commercial planes,

and at the same time they are not handicapped by stops on the way. I submit to the gentleman from Illinois that under our bill, House Joint Resolutions 190 and 196, and the McKellar-Eastland-McClellan substitute over in the Senate, these ballots from the various States could get to any soldier anywhere in the world and back in less than 2 weeks.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. In my judgment, there is no question whatever but what the Army and Navy can and will help to expedite under this plan of ours as provided in the resolution and it will result in getting more ballots to the men and getting them back, thereby giving the men a real chance to vote, rather than under this monstrosity, this cumbersome bill that would require thousands of tons of freight to be sent over in envelopes, as would be the case under the bill that is now being discussed over in the other body known as the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the ballots sent out under House Joint Resolution 190 be the ballots provided by the various State laws? I must plead guilty that Connecticut has a very poor absentee-voter law. Our ballot has no names of candidates either. Would the law have to be amended?

Mr. VURSELL. It would probably have to be amended. I should like to submit to the Members of this House that the Governors of the States, the men and women of the various States of the Union, are interested in the soldiers voting. May I say that many of the State legislatures will be convened early in 1944. We hope and we believe that if we lay down a pattern in this resolution that many of the States will try to conform with it and it may be that some of the States will call a special session of the legislature. It is not too much to call a special session of the legislature because, after all, the people of the various States of this Nation are going to have to pay a tremendous cost in money in order to finance this colossal plan under their war balloting commission bill, and it will be cheaper and less drain upon the taxpayers if some of the States deem it wise to call a special session of the legislature in order to give these boys who are out fighting for our country a chance to vote.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. The same Constitution that preserves control of our elections in the hands of the States also insures freedom of speech and freedom of the press; is that true?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes.

Mr. MANASCO. If in carrying out our war effort we suspend the provisions of the Constitution that protects our election laws and preserves those to the State, could we not at the same time take



away freedom of speech and freedom of the press?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes; and in addition to that we open up the opportunity for considerable fraud, in my judgment, under the proposed war ballot commission.

Mr. MANASCO. If the Congress sets up the machinery to enable the States through their regular functions to send these ballots to the boys on the far-flung battle fronts, have we not discharged our obligation as Members of Congress and is not the responsibility for failure to comply with the act then shifted to the States?

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from Alabama is exactly correct. He has stated the problem in a sound manner. I believe the States generally will attempt to comply, and we can settle this proposition. We can give the soldiers a chance to vote within the framework of the Federal Constitution and the laws of the various States.

Ever since the beginning of this Republic it has been the duty of the States to provide for the holding of elections. Why should we usher in a bureaucracy now to override the interests of the States, when it will not give the soldiers a real ballot and will not give them an opportunity to vote in any greater numbers than under our resolution?

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman will recall that in the election of 1864, when the country was engaged in a terrible civil war, the people who were interested in the elections then still respected the Constitution, and they provided for machinery to make it possible for the soldiers to vote under the State laws and not under Federal law.

Mr. VURSELL. May I point out that there is more involved in this proposed bill than the votes of the soldiers, unless it has been amended in the other body, and if it has I have not been so informed. It takes in all of the American citizens all over the world. You harness them in with the soldiers who are fighting and dying for this country. You take in Mr. Curran and the merchant marine and the employees of the O. W. I., who are over in India sowing discord there, even between our Government and one of our allies. You give them all a chance to come in and vote by this short and anomalous ballot. I am not in favor of harnessing this crowd up on the same footing with the soldiers of this country.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I think in all fairness to the Members of the House the gentleman should say that the committee bill, certainly my bill in the House, does not take in anyone except members of the armed forces.

Mr. VURSELL. In reply, I may say that I have read the committee bill this morning from over in the other body, and there is no indication as far as I know that it is stricken out. I am speaking particularly against the bill introduced in the other body.

Mr. WORLEY. The gentleman is speaking of the Senate bill, not the House bill. I think the House should be permitted to have the information as to what is contained in the House bill.

Mr. VURSELL. If the gentleman is correct, I shall be very glad to accept the correction.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, that is merely a committee print that the gentleman from Texas had printed as a substitute for his own bill, but that committee print cannot be obtained in the document room. Therefore, the Members do not have access to it.

Mr. WORLEY. That is especially why the Members should have the benefit of that information, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to the other Members who have special orders. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a suggestion?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They are trying to make the gentleman believe that it is the Army that is wanting to make this change. With all deference to Colonel Cutler, he is a Boston lawyer and a graduate of Harvard, and probably has a different slant on holding elections from that of our people down in the fork of the creek.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may answer that one point?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes, briefly.

Mr. WORLEY. As the gentleman from Illinois knows, there have been two members, one from the Navy Department and one from the War Department. The gentleman representing the Navy Department has just come from about 8 or 10 months in the Pacific area and was in four major scraps, if that will give any comfort to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Soldiers and sailors have come to our offices who have been all over the world. Practically every one of them said that this Worley-Lucas bill ought not to pass, that if we did anything we ought to pass the Rankin-Eastland substitute, to leave this election machinery in the hands of the States.

Mr. WORLEY. I think the gentleman is slightly prejudiced.

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield further, Mr. Speaker.

In fairness to officers of the Army and Navy, they express the belief that it will be very difficult to handle the transportation on account of the time limit.

Let us admit, for the sake of argument, that due to bad flying weather, which could happen and in some instances may

happen, that on the farthest reaches some of the men in our services may not get their ballots returned in time to be counted. Would it not be better to give those we can reach the whole ballot and a real chance to vote? I submit that it would.

Unfortunately, one of the proponents of the bill from my State is quoted in the press last week as stating in an interview he gave out "that the Republicans were not in favor of the soldiers voting and were trying to defeat the bill." That statement may indicate he is trying to use it as a political vehicle for his reelection even before it has been voted upon. In this enlightened age such charges will not pump any new life into his fast failing political fortunes in Illinois.

The very opposite is the case. Speaking for myself, and I believe for all of the Members on both sides of the aisle, I am anxious for all the soldiers to vote.

He doubtless wants the friends and relatives of the soldiers to believe that he is more anxious than some of us to give the soldiers a right to vote. He does not tell them that his plan does not give the soldiers a real ballot. He does not tell them that the blank ballot form he wants to send them does not have the name of a candidate on it.

And in this connection may I point out that three Democrats have joined in another place in introducing as a substitute to the Lucas-Green bill an amendment almost identical to the joint resolution we will recommend to this body. I am informed many able Members on both sides of that body are supporting it. This refutes the charge and proves our position is clearly nonpartisan.

No, the Republicans and Democrats who oppose this bill are not doing it to prevent the soldiers from voting. We are opposing it because we have sworn to uphold the Constitution and in an attempt to work out a plan that will give our men and women in the armed services a chance to vote a real ballot, the kind they want to vote and will appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, there is less glamor, less sentiment, and less political possibilities in this final thought I want to bring to this debate, but it is of transcending importance. It is this: Let us not overlook our responsibility to the 120,000,000 people here at home. It is our duty to preserve for them an orderly, legal election so that when the votes are cast in November 1944, and counted, we will know then who is elected and will not have to run the risk possibly of the election being thrown into the Supreme Court or into the Congress, with months of delay which would bring chaos to the entire Nation. The soldiers who are fighting for this Nation would be the last ones to want us to take a chance on such a situation.

This election naturally will be decided by the great majority of the voters who yet remain on the home front. It is my opinion that aside from the question of the constitutionality of the Lucas-Green-Worley bill that the people of the Nation will not approve the extension of the

Federal Government into this election by setting up a new bureaucratic Federal ballot control commission, overriding our present election laws of the various States.

#### House Joint Resolution 190

Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting, under the laws of the several States, by members of the armed forces of the United States in time of war

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war.

Sec. 2. It is further suggested and recommended, so as to facilitate such absentee voting by members of the armed forces—

(a) That the several States, in order to avoid expense, duplication of effort, and loss of time, honor applications for absentee ballots by absent voters in the armed forces made by the use of post cards printed pursuant to section 3 of the act of September 16, 1942 (Public, No. 712, 77th Cong.), of which some 11,000,000 have been prepared and are available for such purpose, notwithstanding that such cards refer to the ballot being applied for as an "official war ballot."

(b) That the secretary of state of each of the several States, upon receipt of any such post cards, promptly forward it to the proper county, city, or other election official or officials in order that the request for an absentee ballot may be acted upon as expeditiously as possible.

(c) That the several States cooperate to the end that county, city, or other election officials be authorized and instructed, upon receipt of an application made upon such a card, to mail promptly to the voter making the application, if legally permissible under the laws of the State, a suitable absentee ballot, including therewith a self-addressed envelope for the use of the voter in returning the ballot and any instructions to govern the use of such ballot and envelope.

(d) So that the envelope in which the ballot is sent to the voter, and the envelope supplied for the return of the ballot, may be identified by Post Office Department and other authorities as carrying an election ballot, that there be printed or stamped in a conspicuous place on each such envelope the words "Official election ballot." In the case of States in which no provision is made for sending with the absentee ballots a printed form to be used by a voter for the purpose of establishing his legal right to vote, that appropriate action be taken to have printed and enclosed with absentee ballots mailed in response to applications received on the post cards hereinbefore referred to, a form for the signature and oath or affirmation of the voter; and it is suggested that a form substantially as follows would be appropriate for such purpose:

#### OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 194...

I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

- (1) I am a citizen of the United States;
- (2) The date of my birth was \_\_\_\_\_;
- (3) For \_\_\_\_\_ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of \_\_\_\_\_;
- (4) For \_\_\_\_\_ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of \_\_\_\_\_ in the county of \_\_\_\_\_ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) \_\_\_\_\_;

(5) I am in the armed forces of the United States;

and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contribute, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 194...

Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) shall write his name here.

Officer signing above shall print his rank or rating clearly here.

Sec. 3. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make available to members of the armed forces, at appropriate times, the post cards referred to in section 2, and to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution and attestation, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed forces in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including post cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails, and shall, so far as practicable, be transmitted by air mail.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the information contained in the following letter will show the absolute fallacy of trying to make the Lucas-Worley bill fit into our State elections:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Madison, November 24, 1943.

HON. MERLIN HULL,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: Mr. Zimmerman asked me to write you a supplementary letter in answer to your question as to what changes are necessary in the Wisconsin statutes before the Federal war ballot law, S. 1285 or H. R. 3436, can be given effect in this State. You probably have in mind sections of our statutes as cited in (a), (b), and (c), below.

(a) Section 6.25 (1), under which the county clerk is to print and distribute all ballots for county-wide use at Presidential, State, congressional, legislative, and county elections.

Under subsection (2) of this section, ballots not provided by county clerks are not to be cast or counted in any election.

(b) Section 6.41, under which ballots voted in person and not endorsed by ballot clerks or by the issuing town, city, village, or county clerk, when voted by mail, are void, and the penalty of \$250, or 1 year in the county jail,

is enforceable upon all election officials who receive and vote them.

(c) Section 11.62 forbids any absent voter's ballot, not endorsed by the issuing town, city, village or county clerk, to be accepted and counted at the polls, under penalty of \$100 in fine or 30 days in the county jail.

It would seem, therefore, that the war ballots if printed and distributed by the Army and Navy or by a Federal election commission, as provided in bill S. 1285, would be null and void in Wisconsin, though millions of dollars in tax money were spent in printing, distributing, and transporting them to the polls.

This bill, we understand, after a hearing, has now been returned to the Senate committee for a thorough overhauling.

Will it not, therefore, be wise at this point to pause and inquire through the highest legal or judicial sources as to the jurisdiction of Congress over:

1. The qualifications of electors;  
2. The right of Congress to take over and conduct State elections in distant places of the earth;

3. The right of Congress to repeal State registration, as a convenient form of evidence of domicile in a particular municipality, as to members of the armed forces and at the same time to leave registration in force as to all other electors voting for Federal offices?

It appears to have been settled as early as 1874 and 1875 that the right to vote comes from the State and protection as to opportunity and equality in voting comes from the Nation. (*Minor v. Happersett* (1874), 21 Wall. 162; *United States v. Cruikshank* (1875), 92 U. S. 545 (556), cited by Norton's Constitution of the United States, p. 276.)

If you have other questions in mind which we have not answered, this department will be pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,  
Secretary of State.

By GEO. BROWN,  
Division of Records and Elections.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the committee print of the bill H. R. 3436.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The committee print of the bill is as follows:

A bill to provide a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the armed forces absent from the place of their residence

Be it enacted, etc.—

#### TITLE I

#### SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

Sec. 101. (a) There is established a United States War Ballot Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), which shall be composed of four Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve a term which shall not exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. Two Commissioners shall be members of the political party casting the largest popular vote, and two Commissioners shall be members of the political party casting the second largest popular vote, for Presidential electors in the most recent Presidential election. No Commissioner shall hold or be a candidate for any elective public office. The Commission shall elect from among its members a chairman and a vice chairman. Each Commissioner so appointed shall receive as compensation \$25 for each day in which he



is actually engaged in performing the duties of his office and shall also be reimbursed for any necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. In the event of a tie vote in any matter before it, the Commission shall notify the President, and the President shall request the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to designate an Associate Justice (other than a retired Justice) of such Court, or a circuit judge (other than a retired judge) of the United States, or a justice (other than a retired justice) of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to serve on the Commission for purposes of disposition of such matter, and the justice or judge so designated shall have power to act as temporary chairman of the Commission, with power to cast the deciding vote.

(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the Civil Service Act, rules and regulations, an Executive Director, and such other officers, employees, or agents as may be necessary for the performance of its duties under this act. The Commission may receive assistance from other Federal departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this act. The Commission may delegate such of its powers or duties under this act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes thereof.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission, acting so far as practicable in consultation with representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the other agencies and officials charged with the performance of duties under this act, to formulate such plans, make such arrangements, and adopt such measures not inconsistent with the purposes of this act as it may deem appropriate to further the purposes of this act and facilitate its administration. The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act, except that when the Commission becomes cognizant of any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act on the part of persons serving in the armed forces, the Commission shall report to the Secretary of War or to the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, who shall make investigation and report thereon to the Commission. As soon as practicable after any election to which the provisions of this title apply, the Commission shall report to the Congress on the administration of the act, including the number of ballots received by the Commission and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States, the reports received by the Commission from the secretaries of state and any neglect, misconduct, or irregularity found pursuant to this section. Any Commissioner disagreeing as to the contents of the report may set forth his separate views.

#### VOTERS ELIGIBLE UNDER THIS TITLE

SEC. 102. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "members of the armed forces of the United States" means members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

(2) The term "United States" used geographically includes only the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

(b) In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual who is a member of the armed forces of the United States, and who is absent from the place of his voting residence but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote under the law of the State of his voting residence in any election for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress, shall be entitled to

vote for such officers in accordance with the provisions of this title.

#### PAYMENT OF POLL TAX NOT REQUIRED

SEC. 103. No member of the armed forces of the United States shall, in time of war, be required, as a condition of voting in any election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

#### OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOTS, ENVELOPES, AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING PROCEDURE

SEC. 104. (a) The commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use in voting in general elections under this title an adequate number of official Federal war ballots. Each ballot shall be printed in the following form insofar as the officers enumerated are appropriate to the particular election:

#### OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT FOR USE IN GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19\_\_

Instructions: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office, or write in the name of his political party—Democratic, Republican, or other.

#### ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President or the name of his party \_\_\_\_\_

#### UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator or the name of his party \_\_\_\_\_

#### REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district or the name of his party \_\_\_\_\_

#### REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR STATE

(Only in the States entitled thereto)

(Vote for one or two, as the case may be)

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large or the name of his party \_\_\_\_\_

A vote by party designation shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidate of that party by name. A vote for a Presidential candidate by name or by party shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party. No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

(b) The commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in enclosing and sealing the official Federal war ballots. Each such envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

#### OFFICIAL INNER ENVELOPE FOR OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT, FOR USE IN GENERAL ELECTION

Name of voter \_\_\_\_\_  
(Print your name plainly here)

#### Home residence:

Street and number (if any) or rural route \_\_\_\_\_

(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

City or town (if any) \_\_\_\_\_

(Print city or town plainly here)

County \_\_\_\_\_

(Print county plainly here)

Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

#### OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19\_\_

I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

(2) The date of my birth was \_\_\_\_\_

(3) For \_\_\_\_\_ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of \_\_\_\_\_

(4) For \_\_\_\_\_ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of \_\_\_\_\_ in the county of \_\_\_\_\_ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) \_\_\_\_\_

(5) I am in the armed forces of the United States; and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_.

(Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) shall write his name here.)

(Officer signing above shall print his rank or rating clearly here.)

(c) The commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the commission official Federal war ballots and official inner envelopes. Each such envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon such outer envelope the following shall be printed:

Free of all postage, including air mail (official Federal war ballot).

To the United States war ballot commission: For transmission to the secretary of state of the State shown below:

Voter's home address:

Street and number (if any) or rural route \_\_\_\_\_

(Print clearly)

City or town (if any) \_\_\_\_\_

(Print clearly)

County \_\_\_\_\_

(Print clearly)

State \_\_\_\_\_

(Print clearly)

(d) Ballots and envelopes for use under this title shall be suitable for air mailing.

(e) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of instructions for voting procedure for use in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(f) Where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

#### BALLOTING

SEC. 105. (a) Any person voting under the provisions of this title shall privately mark

the ballot, place it in the official inner envelope, and securely seal such envelope. He shall then fill in and subscribe the oath printed upon the official inner envelope. After the oath has been duly attested, the voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope, shall fill in and securely seal such outer envelope, and shall deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots for transmission to the Commission.

(b) Any commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) in the armed forces of the United States is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this title. All such oaths shall constitute prima facie evidence that the voter is qualified to vote, unless the statements contained in such oath indicate the contrary.

#### ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 106. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the armed forces entitled to vote under this title.

#### TRANSMISSION OF FEDERAL BALLOTS, ENVELOPES, AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING PROCEDURE

SEC. 107. (a) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish to the Secretaries of War and Navy, well in advance of the election, an adequate number of ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure.

(b) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, transmit to the various units of the armed forces, in ample time to insure balloting under this title in such general election, an adequate number of ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, as furnished by the Commission.

#### LISTS OF CANDIDATES

SEC. 108. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for balloting under this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, in ample time for balloting under this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. However, incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to balloting under the provisions of this title. No such list of candidates shall contain any information with respect to any candidate other than his name and address, his party affiliation, and the office for which he has been nominated.

#### DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF BALLOTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 109. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and to the fullest extent compatible with military operations, shall cause ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates to be distributed to members of the armed forces in ample time to insure an opportunity to vote in general elections under this title and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the Commission.

(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations the appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

(1) To designate a balloting day for voting in general elections which shall be, wherever possible, after he has received a list of candidates from all States, but which shall not be later than the date which the Commission may fix for the area in which his command is located;

(2) To cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places prior to and on the balloting day and to cause copies of instructions for voting procedure and all other necessary information to be furnished to members of his unit;

(3) On the designated day, to cause official Federal war ballots and officials envelopes to be distributed, to provide a convenient place for marking such ballots in secret, and to cause executed ballots to be collected and delivered for transmission to the Commission;

(4) To assume general responsibility for assuring that every voter in his unit has an opportunity to vote; and

(5) To destroy, as soon as practicable after the balloting day, all official Federal war ballots in his custody remaining unused.

#### PRIORITIES

SEC. 110. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of official Federal war ballots, official envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and communications under this title priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Ballots cast outside the United States shall, wherever practicable to expedite their delivery, be transmitted by air.

#### TRANSMISSION

SEC. 111. (a) The Commission, upon receiving any ballot cast under this title, shall promptly transmit it to the secretary of state of the State of the voter's residence, who shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, or county or other voting unit of the voter's residence. No person other than such appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain a ballot cast under this title.

(b) In order to expedite the transmission of ballots cast outside the United States to the appropriate election officials, the Commission may establish such regional offices as may be necessary to receive such ballots, sort them out, and forward them to the appropriate secretaries of state.

#### REPORTS

SEC. 112. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall report to the Commission on balloting under this title, including the number of ballots distributed, received, and transmitted to the Commission, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

(b) The Commission shall prepare a statement of all ballots received and transmitted to the various secretaries of state. Each secretary of state shall prepare an account of all ballots received by him and transmitted to the various election officials, who shall prepare accounts of all such ballots received and of all such ballots counted, and return such accounts to the secretary of state. Within 30 days after the last day for counting absentee ballots in any election in which ballots are cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall report such accounts to the Commission, together with any comments or explanation thereof.

#### VALIDITY OF BALLOTS

SEC. 113. (a) Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted,

and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in accordance with the laws of such State in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

(b) No executed official Federal war ballot shall be valid if—

(1) The voter has also voted in person or by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

(2) The date of the oath of elector is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

(3) Such ballot is received by the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence later than the closing of the polls on the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots cast under this title.

(c) All official ballot envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery, and all official ballot envelopes not delivered, to polling places or to the proper officials shall not be opened but shall be endorsed with the date on which they were received by such secretary and shall be retained by him until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed under his supervision without examination.

(d) In certifying the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President under section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., title 3, sec. 7a), the executive of each State shall also certify that there has been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title. If the executive of the State does not make such certification, or if the United States War Ballot Commission certifies that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title, the Senate and House of Representatives, acting separately, shall concurrently decide whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors in the State as to require such appointment to be treated as invalid.

#### VOTING SAFEGUARDS

SEC. 114. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast hereunder.

#### PENALTIES

SEC. 115. (a) Whoever willfully and without justification deprives any voter of any right or privilege provided for in this title, or interferes or attempts to interfere with the right of any person to vote, or to vote as he may choose, under the provisions of this title, or willfully refuses or fails to count any ballot validly cast under the provisions of this title, or whoever does or attempts to do any fraudulent act in connection with the casting of ballots under this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not make criminal any act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations.

(b) All existing provisions of law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply with respect to elections and voting pursuant to the provisions of this title.

#### APPROPRIATE STATE OFFICIALS

SEC. 116. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function



vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term "secretary of state" shall mean such other official.

#### OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES TO ACT FOR SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 117. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of such State and local officials and agencies for such purposes and to such extent as he may deem appropriate in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title.

#### ACT TO BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED

SEC. 118. No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes, and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

#### TITLE II

#### VOTING UNDER STATE LAW FOR STATE AS WELL AS FEDERAL OFFICERS

##### POST CARDS

SEC. 201. In order to afford an opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for State officials and to utilize State absentee balloting procedures to the greatest extent possible, the Commission shall cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretaries of War and Navy an adequate number of post cards for use in accordance with the provisions of this title. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be made available, at appropriate times, upon request, to members of the armed forces located within the United States, and, where State procedures can be effectively employed, to members of the armed forces located in other places.

Upon one side of the post card shall be printed the following:

Secretary of state of -----

Being in the armed forces of the United States, I hereby request an absentee ballot to vote in the coming ----- (primary, general, or special) election.

(1) I am a citizen of the United States.

(2) The date of my birth was -----

(3) For ----- years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of -----

(4) For ----- years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of -----, in the county of -----, at (street and number, if any, or rural route) -----

Please send the ballot to me at the following address:

(Print your name clearly above)

(Write your usual signature above)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ----- day of -----, 194-----

(Commissioned officer writes here his name and rank)

Upon the other side of the post card shall be printed the following:

Free of postage, including air mail (war ballot).

Secretary of state of -----,

(City)

(State)

#### FUNCTION OF POST CARDS

SEC. 202. Such post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as application for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws.

No voter shall be precluded from voting under the provisions of title I of this act by reason of any post-card application made under this title, unless such voter casts an absentee ballot.

#### INFORMATION REGARDING ELECTIONS

SEC. 203. The Commission shall, at appropriate times, furnish the Secretaries of War and Navy with any information received from a secretary of state as to the dates of elections in such State, including general, special, and primary elections. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall cause, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, such information to be made available to members of the armed forces.

#### TITLE III

##### MISCELLANEOUS

##### AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

##### TRANSMISSION FREE OF POSTAGE

SEC. 302. The transmission of all communications under titles I and II of this act shall be free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

##### VOTING UNDER STATE LAW PERMITTED

SEC. 303. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence, if he does not elect to vote in accordance with the provisions of title I of this act.

##### SEPARABILITY

SEC. 304. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

##### REPEAL OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 16, 1942

SEC. 305. The act entitled "An act to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942 (Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress), is hereby repealed.

##### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, with certain enclosures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

#### TAXATION

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate this morning and advocated the same tax program as he did before the House Ways and Means Committee several weeks ago. The program had the full and deliberate consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means, which was unable to justify it and, instead, reported the measure passed by the House last Wednesday.

The attitude of the Secretary would indicate that the administration is not going to be satisfied with the recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee and the action of the House, and, what is more important, this difference of opinion would indicate that we still have a tax problem. That problem goes beyond thoughts of the amount of money that should be raised and involves matters which ought to have the thoughtful consideration of Congress.

The remarks made on Wednesday during the debate were directed more particularly to the provisions of the measure before us. My purpose today is to supplement the thoughts expressed at that time with some general observations as to the effect of increased Federal taxes.

#### REVOLUTION BY TAXATION

It is apparent that a revolution is occurring in Federal taxation. This revolution carries with it, unfortunately, the clear implication of a vast social revolution, unless recent trends are checked. After World War No. 1, Federal taxes declined from a peak of \$6,700,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1920 and were continued during the 1920's at a level of \$4,000,000,000. When, in 1938, tax receipts again ran close to \$5,000,000,000, the country thought it was paying very heavy taxes. In the fiscal year of 1939, Federal taxes amounted to \$5,200,000,000. During the fiscal year 1944 they may rise to \$45,000,000,000. Now the Treasury has proposed to saddle the taxpayers with \$10,500,000,000 in new taxes as a modest reminder that we are engaged in World War No. 2.

Of course, taxes may be reduced after the war. But, to maintain the military and civil expenditures which now loom up as necessary in the years following the war, it may be imperative to raise \$20,000,000,000 or more annually in taxes for many years. Our tax payments after this war may be four or five times our tax payments before the war, and to our Federal tax payments we must add payments of \$10,000,000,000 or more in taxes to our State and local governments. The revolution by taxation threatens the existence of our free enterprise system of business, the existence of our middle class, and the existence of our States.

#### TAXATION AND FREE ENTERPRISE

First, consider the tax threat to our enterprise system. Under our free-enterprise system, the owners and managers of

business undertakings have supplied the capital and managerial ability to conduct business efficiently, producing vast quantities of goods and services for the customers who have been eager to satisfy their wants for automobiles, radios, telephones, and a myriad variety of articles. Those who assumed the risks of promoting new inventions and producing these and staple articles, who ventured their capital and their abilities, knew that if they were successful in supplying the consumers they would reap economic rewards. The system provided incentives to work and save, to produce at ever lower costs, and to assume all the risks entailed in business. In producing for the consumer, work was provided for the masses so that they would earn the higher incomes they wanted in order to purchase the expanding stream of goods and services flowing into the markets.

The system of free enterprise did not always operate perfectly and the reformers sought to destroy it and to establish in its place a Government-controlled economy. No doubt Government must cooperate with business, must at times regulate and aid it, if business is to function most effectively for the whole society. But when Government supplants private business, the incentives to thrift and work, to saving and risk taking, to efficiency and low costs, are weakened. Government control of industry need not come directly by outright condemnation and purchase. It may come indirectly through confiscatory taxation and a multitude of stringent regulations which deaden the spirit of free enterprise and drain off its resources.

Our corporate taxes are now imposed at terrific rates. The normal and surtaxes are graduated up to 40 percent and the excess-profits tax may rise to 90 percent, except as it is reduced by the inadequate 10-percent credit for debt payment and post-war needs. These taxes together may take as much as 80 percent of a corporation's income and remove virtually all incentive to assume the added risk of new and greater production. Now the Treasury would go further and increase the combined normal and surtax to a maximum of 50 percent.

What would the effects of this drastic step be? Contrary to popular opinions, corporations have not enjoyed large profits after their taxes have been paid, they have not been paying out great dividends, and they have not been piling up huge surpluses. Our corporations urgently need funds for conversion to post-war production. They urgently need funds to provide the equipment and materials required to meet the accumulating reservoir of consumer demand which will break in a flood of buying after the war.

But the tax rates have been so high that corporations have been unable to save the funds they will need after the war. Everywhere business enterprises are seriously concerned over the inadequacy of funds for financing their post-war requirements. The universal demand everywhere in the world of business for deductions from taxation to

permit the laying away of funds is a convincing demonstration that corporate tax rates have passed the point of danger.

At the height of prosperity in the year 1929, Federal corporation taxes amounted to \$1,181,000,000 and the profits remaining after taxes were \$7,972,000,000. Dividend payments were \$5,778,000,000.

In the year 1942, although corporate profits before taxes were \$18,784,000,000 as compared with \$9,153,000,000 in 1929, taxes had increased over 10 times and were \$11,900,000,000. Profits after taxes were \$6,884,000,000, or \$1,088,000,000 less than in 1929. Dividend payments were \$3,983,000,000, or \$1,795,000,000 less than in 1929. These are all Department of Commerce figures. At this stage it is still uncertain if 1943 will not present an even less favorable picture for corporations than 1942.

In the period 1929 to 1942, while corporate profits after taxes and dividends were declining, wage and salary payments were increasing from \$52,000,000,000 to \$78,000,000,000. The net income of farmers has also been rising during the war and the workers and farmers have, in general, enjoyed real increases in their purchasing power. Meanwhile the owners of corporations were not enjoying larger profits and dividends, after taxes had taken their heavy toll, and their purchasing power has been declining.

Corporations have recently been saving out of their earnings about \$3,000,000,000 annually, a relatively small sum when their post-war capital requirements and their increased risks are considered. Individuals have increased their savings phenomenally, however. They put aside nearly \$27,000,000,000 in 1942 and may save \$36,000,000,000 in 1943, according to the Department of Commerce.

Of course these are aggregate figures and they do not tell the story of particular corporations. But the general trend is clear. The take of Uncle Sam out of corporation earnings has multiplied from a little over \$1,000,000,000 in 1929 to nearly \$12,000,000,000 in 1942, and may rise to \$14,000,000,000 or more in 1943. Two-thirds of total corporate earnings are now being taken in taxes and the Treasury wants still more.

The answer invariably given by the proponents of higher taxes to the suggestion that present taxes are already an oppressive weight on corporations is that the corporations, if they lack capital after the war, can obtain it from Government-regulated banks or from Government-regulated capital markets. The critics of free enterprise also say that corporations should not be allowed to plow back their earnings but should be compelled to come to the Government or Government-controlled financial sources for funds.

Thus confiscatory taxation would be employed to choke the spirit of free enterprise and remove the cheapest and most accessible source of funds. Thus by taxation the Government would become the virtual owner of business and

industry. Thus by taxation state socialism or fascism would be inaugurated.

#### THE THREAT TO THE MIDDLE CLASS

I have spoken of the threat of crushing taxation to private enterprise, which we have long regarded a typical American institution. Another democratic institution, the great middle class of skilled and white-collar workers, of small enterprisers and professional people, of prosperous farmers and others with moderate incomes, is now threatened by the menace of regulatory taxation which would squeeze out of existence those with incomes above \$2,500.

At first our tax policies were directed against those with incomes above \$1,000,000. Then the \$100,000 class was bludgeoned by taxation, and more recently the \$25,000 group. Now we have the Treasury tax proposals to strike at those with incomes above \$2,500 and to soften the load on those with lower incomes. This is class legislation pure and simple—an open bid for the votes of the masses with lower incomes. In time the attack will be directed toward the \$2,000 class, and eventually, perhaps, the \$1,500 incomes, until all families have equal shares of the national product.

Now I have no brief for soaking the poor with heavy taxes. They should be spared from excessive burdens. So should the great middle class, which has always been the stabilizing influence in American society. Our goal should be the raising of the incomes at the bottom until all of our families are in the middle class, rather than tearing down the middle class and lowering all family incomes to the poverty level.

The Treasury income-tax proposal would take little in higher taxes from family incomes below \$2,500, and that would largely be refunded, or more than refunded, after the war. Disregarding the effects of the 12.5-percent tax rate increase arising this year from the enactment of the Current Tax Payment Act, a married man with two children would have left, after paying his income tax, the following, according to Treasury estimates:

A \$2,000 net income, \$1,919.

A \$3,000 net income, \$2,616.

A \$5,000 net income, \$3,837.

A \$10,000 net income, \$6,445.

A \$25,000 net income, \$11,250.

Of course, there would have to be paid the 12.5-percent rate increase due this year and next, which the Treasury has forgotten to mention, and any income taxes imposed by State and local governments.

I have recently read a very interesting article in the United States News of October 15, 1943. I commend that article to you. It shows how the middle class is being wiped out by Federal taxation.

It may not be possible in the future for the middle class to have insurance beyond the very modest pensions provided by the Government. It may not be possible to send the children to college. It may not be possible to leave a small estate for the dependent sur-



vivors. It may not be possible to contribute to churches and to charities, to hospitals and educational institutions.

Certainly, after the Federal Government has taken its taxes and the State and local government taxes are paid, those with income above \$2,500 will have little enough left, and the Treasury would take a large part of that small residue.

Of course, if you look to an era when all individuals will be working for the Government, and will depend upon the Government for their care in sickness, old-age, and death, you will not be concerned over the survival of the great middle class. But if you hold faith in American democracy, you will not want to destroy that large group which, neither rich nor poor, has provided our democracy with leaders in the past and has contributed so much to its cultural and religious life—to its system of free enterprise.

I ask you to avoid the liquidation of the middle class by taxation. The fixed incomes are being hard hit by rising living costs and by taxes which are now oppressively heavy. It would be fatal to American democracy to undermine the middle class further by confiscatory taxation, which would leave us a race of peasants and factory workers.

#### CAN OUR STATES SURVIVE?

Finally, I mention the threat to our States in the recent taxing and spending trends of the Federal Government. By our vast expansion of Federal taxation we are depriving the States of their vital revenue sources. We have invaded the inheritance, gasoline, and income-tax fields, and we might as well invade the retail sales-tax field directly as by the indirect method of excise taxes. We used to think that property taxation was safely preserved for the State and local governments, but now we have a Federal use tax on automobile and motorboats which is, in effect, a tax on a certain kind of property. We have learned from the levy of the Federal estate, gift, and use taxes that we can, in the disguise of an excise, tax property by taxing its transfer or its use. In Congress there have also been proposals to place an excise upon intangible property. What is left for the State and local governments?

With Federal taxes taking forty or forty-five billion dollars from income of individuals and corporations, consumption, and other sources, it is very difficult for the State and local governments to maintain their revenues. After the war, when Federal taxes may amount to twenty or twenty-five billion dollars annually, the pressure upon these governments to lower their taxes will be tremendous.

How can these governments survive without independent revenue sources? Many view the situation with no alarm. They would centralize all taxes at Washington and share the proceeds with the States. Living on a dole, the States would, indeed, be political paupers which had been sold out to the Federal Government.

Federal grants to the State and local governments have increased tremendously. The centralizers are crying for new and bigger grants for education, health, highways, welfare, and many other services. Federal authority is growing apace and State authority is weakening. If we wish our States to survive, and I believe they are indispensable elements in American democracy, we must call a halt upon centralized taxation and spending.

#### CONCLUSION

I have spoken of three threats in the flood of Federal taxes to fundamental American institutions. If free enterprise, the middle class, and our States are to continue to exist, Federal taxes must soon recede and must certainly not rise higher.

If we want to introduce communism, I see no quicker and more effective way than confiscatory taxation which will wipe out our corporations, place a low ceiling on incomes, and bleed the States.

If this is what we are fighting for, our crusade for democracy is a sorry spectacle indeed. While our boys are crushing fascism abroad, we are inviting it at home. While they are fighting centralized authority in Germany and Japan, we are opening our doors to social revolution and a centralized dictatorship in America.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 15 minutes allotted to me be transferred to the end of the day, after all other special orders, and that I may proceed at that time for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three different particulars, and to include an article appearing in the Boston Globe; also a letter from the Touchdown Club of Washington, and a letter from the American Taxation Clinic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from

Kansas [Mr. WINTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### ELEVEN WEEKS OF DEMOCRATIC LETHARGY

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, we are now starting into the twelfth week of the sessions of the House of Representatives since we came back from our recess which ended on the 14th day of September. But the Democratic leadership of this House, in 11 long weeks, has only had 166 hours in which the House of Representatives has been in session, and less than one-third of that time was devoted to the consideration of matters brought to the floor of the House of Representatives by the Democratic leadership. It is no wonder, therefore, that we felt it necessary to organize our Drive-for-Action Committee, in an effort to compel the Democratic leadership to take off the brakes so Congress can act on the issues upon which the country is calling for action. You can look in the RECORD and find just exactly how much time we have spent in session. Here is the record:

The Fulbright resolution has been passed by this House. House joint resolution 159, which provides for the care of wives of enlisted men and some of their dependents. An amendment to the National Housing Act. House Concurrent Resolution No. 33. This was a good one, providing for additional copies of House Resolution 30 which authorized an investigation regarding the progress of the war.

Then we have passed H. R. 3381, relating to the Victory tax credits.

H. R. 5363, extending the time that applications might be made under the excess-profits tax, and renegotiation of contracts.

We repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act.

We passed a slight amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act.

We passed the deficiency appropriation bill.

We passed a resolution paying for the expenses of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who are attending the United Nations Food and Relief Conference.

We passed a resolution extending the term of office of the President of the Philippines.

We passed H. R. 3356 increasing the compensation rates and pensions of disabled veterans and H. R. 3377 increasing veterans' pensions.

We passed the Commodity Credit legislation banning consumers' food subsidies and the tax bill. That is the complete record of so-called major legislation passed by this House in 11 weeks. That is all there is—there is not any more. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Democratic leadership, which is directly responsible for this sorry showing, becomes nettled and ill-tempered when it is challenged by our Drive-for-Action Committee.

We have just begun to fight. We shall continue to insist that the Democratic

majority, which exercises complete control over this Congress and its committees, take action to permit the duly elected Representatives of the people who sit in this House to pass upon all necessary remedial legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was quite disturbed this morning when I picked up a copy of today's Washington Daily News and read an article entitled, "Effect May Hamstring Loyalty Inquiries. Civil Service Bans Check on Workers' Red Activities."

This is an article by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. This article is of such great importance at this time that I am going to take the time of the House to read it.

It reads as follows:

#### CIVIL SERVICE BANS CHECK ON WORKERS' RED ACTIVITIES—EFFECT MAY HAMSTRING LOYALTY INQUIRIES

United States civil-service investigators conducting "loyalty investigations" of Government employees and applicants for Federal jobs are now forbidden to ask them any general questions regarding their political philosophy or their belief in capitalism, it was learned here today.

Furthermore, an order issued November 3 by the Civil Service Commission specifically bans questions concerning activities in Communist unions or in any of the Communist-front organizations.

The order, which went out to some 800 investigators throughout the country, drastically curtails the procedure for determining whether Federal employees are Communists.

Its effect, according to some investigatory agencies here, will be to hamstring the investigators in their loyalty inquiries for the War and Navy Departments, the O. W. I., and all other branches of the Federal service.

#### LOCAL GROUP NAMED

The order specifically forbids inquiries about the Abraham Lincoln Brigade "or any other of the many Spanish relief groups," the Lawyers Guild, the League of Women Shoppers, and the Harry Bridges Defense Committee. Most of these are pro-Communist or Communist-controlled.

Instruction No. 4 says: "Do not ask any question about membership in the Washington Book Shop or any book shop in any city similar to the Washington Book Shop."

In a confidential memorandum issued last year to aid Federal department heads to determine the loyalty of their employees, the Attorney General included the Washington Book Shop among 12 organizations he found to be Communist-controlled.

#### WARNED OF DISCIPLINE

Order No. 6 forbids the Government investigator to ask any question of an applicant or jobholder which might show that his wife or husband, as the case may be, or the members of his family are Communists.

Order 12 forbids inquiring about the applicant's favorite reading matter "especially the Daily Worker and all radical and liberal publications."

The order concludes: "From time to time you will receive additional instructions as to what to do and what not to do in the

course of investigation of loyalty cases. The foregoing instructions are to be rigidly observed and any deviation therefrom will be cause for disciplinary action."

The order was signed by L. A. Moyer, executive director and chief examiner for the Commission, and initiated by Alfred Klein, a Commission attorney.

#### BARRED FROM PAY ROLLS

Under the Hatch law, Communists as well as Nazis and Fascists are barred from the Federal pay rolls. But Communists scarcely ever admit they are such. Hence, the practice of Federal investigating bodies is to show an over-all picture of activity in Communist fronts.

One of the few ways in which Communists show their hand is by their leadership of Communist unions or Communist factions within unions. Instruction No. 1 of the Commission's order declares, however:

#### QUESTIONING RESTRICTED

"Under no circumstances should any question be asked of an applicant or a witness involving union membership, union associations, or union activities. Not only should the applicant not be asked about membership in a union but any question should be avoided which might elicit from the applicant or from a witness union membership or activities."

If "witnesses say that a certain person is a Communist because he has associated with certain persons in a union known or said to be Communists," order No. 2 says, the investigator should inquire no further into the subject.

"In other words," No. 2 concludes, "the question of unionism should not be brought up in any way in an investigation, either directly or indirectly."

Regarding Spanish relief groups in America, order 3 says: "The whole matter of the war in Spain should be scrupulously avoided by the investigator as having any bearing on pro-Communism."

No. 15 says: "Do not ask general questions regarding the political philosophy of the applicant, such as whether he believes in capitalism or what his opinion is regarding certain events of a current or historical nature."

#### LIST NOT COMPLETE

In forbidding questions about the Harry Bridges Defense Committee, the Lawyers' Guild, and the League of Women Shoppers, the order includes two non-Communist groups—the Socialist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union. But order 14 points out, "This is not a complete list of organizations about which no questions should be asked. . . . If the investigator is in doubt, the best policy is not to ask the question."

Questions about color, race, creed, or religion and those "under the category of 'snooping'" are specifically banned also.

Spokesmen for the Commission today admitted the existence of the November 3 order but declined to make it public officially.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there anything in any of those instructions which prohibits those investigators from asking whether or not an applicant belongs to the D. A. R., to the America First Committee, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or any other patriotic organization?

Mr. BUSBEY. The organizations to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] refers are not listed in this article.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered. Because of the investigations being carried on by some of the Government snoopers, it seems that if you belong to America First, or the D. A. R., or the Loyal Dames, or any of those organizations, you are condemned and deprived of a job. Did the gentleman find out anything about that?

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his observation, and, in my opinion, it is particularly true in the Office of War Information.

I am a firm believer in free speech. I have never in my life tried to prevent anybody from voicing his opinions on any subject, regardless of what it might be. But the restrictions and regulations such as those issued by the Civil Service Commission under date of November 3, absolutely destroy the very purpose for which the Civil Service Commission was established. If we have this condition to contend with, how are we going to be able to find out whether a man is connected with the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, or the Communist Party?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives should make a very exhaustive and extensive study and survey into this question and find out who was back of these instructions by the Civil Service Commission. Where did the pressure come from, and why were these instructions issued? Let us stop and think for a moment what the effect will be on the investigators in the field. First of all, with many of the best investigators of the Civil Service Commission in the armed forces of our country, they have had to recruit many investigators who are not schooled in investigating work.

The work load of the Civil Service Commission has been terrific. Some of these investigators have been very diligent in going through an investigation to find out a man's background and affiliations, then when they receive these instructions are going to say: "Oh, what the hell's the use anyway?" It will discourage these investigators in the field from ascertaining who are loyal, patriotic Americans, and who are the individuals on our pay roll who are against this constitutional republican form of government of ours.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman let me propound this question? Is it not equally true that in the laxity that may be in effect in obtaining investigators, if you get one who may be allied with the organizations we are excluding from interrogation here, that by his very knowledge, having been on the inside, he could fill the Civil Service Commission rolls with that type of individual?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Members will remember the trouble we went through during the past year trying to take three individuals off the Federal pay roll, men who were found guilty of subversive activities by the Kerr committee. This, to me, appears to be just another one of



the obstacles thrown in the way by the administration, of thorough investigation to find out who are the disloyal employees on the Federal pay roll. It is hard enough now to get them off; in fact, almost impossible. But if these instructions are allowed to remain, there will be no possible chance of ever getting a subversive off the pay roll.

These instructions, if allowed to stand, will be cause for great rejoicing among the Communists of this country, because it is exactly what they have been talking, hoping, and praying for, for a long, long time. I do not hesitate to say that the pay rolls of our Government now have hundreds of known Communists, or fellow travelers on there who should be removed, but who never will be eliminated if the investigators are not allowed to thoroughly investigate their loyalties.

We have a duty to the men and women in the armed services of this country. They are depending on the Congress of the United States to see to it, after the war is over and they return, that they have returned to the same constitutional republic we had when they left. If we do not do it, who will? I appreciate the fact that it is just as bad to go clear over to the right and be a reactionary as it is to go clear over to the left and be a Communist. Fortunately, however, our forefathers saw to it that this Constitution of ours was a golden mean between the two extremes. Let us keep it so, for if we permit things like this to go on we shall find this Government going to the left a great deal faster than it is even now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know any way to stop this matter except by an act of Congress?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think, as I said, that the Civil Service Committee should make a thorough investigation and that some action should be taken, and taken now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But in view of the fact that our request that certain named men be stricken from the pay roll was disregarded, what good will an investigation do unless we pass a positive act, unless we pass legislation nullifying this or any similar order?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The issue before the people of this country today is simply this: Are we going to let these long-haired New Deal bureaucrats continue on their road and make a completely collectivist, Marxist, regimented, totalitarian, dictatorship out of this country, or are we going to be red-blooded, patriotic Americans and continue to fight to restore constitutional representative government to the people of this country? That is the challenge that faces us here today.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What are we going to do with a particular situation like this,

where we have legislation with reference to the three employees who have been mentioned, yet where a Cabinet member takes the position in advance of the case ever being submitted to a court, that the act we passed was unconstitutional, therefore he is not bound in any way to pay any attention to the act of Congress and proceeds to tell these people to stay on the pay roll, as in the case of a certain gentleman who now occupies a certain position in the Virgin Islands at the present time operating under the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes?

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the only thing we can do is to bring these matters to the attention of the people of the country and then pray to God they may remedy it next year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It seems to me we can go a little further than that: We can cut that department off from access to any funds. If they then wanted to keep those three individuals at the expense of everyone else that would be their responsibility. It is our business to appropriate money. If they do not spend it the way we direct that it be spent then let us not give them any more.

Mr. BUSBEY. The Civil Service Commission is the only investigating agency we can get any information from regarding the loyalty of Government employees. Reports of the F. B. I., G-2 of the Army, and of the Office of Naval Intelligence are not made available to anyone.

So if these gag instructions are allowed to stand, we will not be able to get any information from a single Government agency regarding these subversives, and we will never have a chance of exposing them to the people of this country in their nefarious activities. I hope the Civil Service Committee will take immediate action to correct this situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after all other special orders heretofore entered have been disposed of, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know how many special orders there are for tomorrow but there are quite a few. The Democrats want to have a caucus on the adjournment of the House tomorrow.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will change that request to Wednesday to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, by this time we are all aware of the fiasco known as the Canol project in northern Canada where the United States Government has spent in excess of \$100,000,000 for the purpose of developing a field of questionable possibilities, and which has proven to be definitely a very costly and unsatisfactory venture. There are other implications, which have nothing to do with the oil situation, but which are important and one is the attempt by friends of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell to place the blame on some subordinates, but I think the record will definitely prove that no oil man of any creditability has recommended this field to General Somervell. So, therefore, the blame should definitely rest upon the man in charge of this Department, General Somervell.

Rather than have this a fault-finding episode, it is my recommendation that we salvage from this great mistake as much as possible and turn our efforts toward something constructive, the development in American territory of an oil reserve which leading oil experts recognize has a far better geologic setting than an untested oil area either in Alaska or on the North American continent. This fact was known before the Army's venture in Canol.

Now, let us briefly review what has been said on this floor, and what information has been brought out concerning this oil reserve, and also what correspondence has been transacted between myself and the Navy. On February 26, I made my maiden speech by asking the Navy Department what it was doing about the naval oil reserve in northwestern Alaska. I called attention to the fact that Japan knew about this because she had flown in an emissary of good will to Nome, which is only 400 miles from this reserve, back in 1939. I also included a report made for this specific purpose by W. T. Foran, a geologic engineer with adequate experience.

Mr. Foran, following his 2 years spent in study of the naval oil reserve in northwestern Alaska spent the next 12 years in the employ of the foreign staff of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey as an oil geologist and explorer. Most of this was spent in the Argentine and Bolivia. The following 4½ years, he spent in the Middle East in the employ of both the Standard Oil and Shell. I am merely mentioning this to show his capabilities and background, which place him in a position to give counsel and advice as to the potentialities and possibilities of this oil area comprising the Alaskan Naval Reserve.

In this report, Mr. Foran points out the fact that the climatic conditions compare with Montana and Alberta oil producing regions; that this Alaskan reserve is not situated in a region of past or present glaciation. He also points out how equipment can be flown in or taken in by marine transportation. He also gives the geological details.

On April 8, I wrote the Navy inquiring as to what is being done toward the development of this naval reserve, and received a letter from them on April 12. I wish to quote the following paragraph from this letter:

The matter of the possible use of the Alaskan reserve has been considered seriously for the past several years by the Navy Department and is now being investigated by the Army and Navy Petroleum Board on which Brig. Gen. Walter Pyron represents the Army and Capt. A. F. Carter represents the Navy.

The Navy also went on to state that Mr. Coghill, of the Bureau of the Budget, had visited California, and had contacted Mr. Foran. In this letter, they included a statement of the entire prospective oil areas of Alaska and adjacent regions. I included that statement in the Record when I addressed the House on October 11 on the Canol oil project, at which time I was the first one to officially call attention to this Canol episode. Here is a significant point: this report was handed to Mr. Coghill during March of this year, and Mr. Foran at this time made this statement about the Canol project, which is technically known as the Fort Norman area.

1. The entire production of the Fort Norman area does not exceed at capacity 3,000 barrels of oil a day. This volume is from a system of some 20 wells located in an area well over 500 miles from tidewater. Normally production of such volume is considered of minor importance and, except under stress of great necessity, would never warrant the construction of a 500-mile pipe line over extremely mountainous terrain.

Remember, this statement in itself should have caused some questioning by Mr. Coghill, of the Bureau of the Budget, because I am quite sure testimony will bear out that no competent oil man of experience has recommended this Canol project.

Now, this much can be said in defense of the Army and that is that the Canol was the only developed area in existence at the time; however, it was only producing 300 barrels a day and had been operating over 20 years. It must also be borne in mind that conditions have changed in this war. Now the Army finds it necessary to use as much, if not more, oil than the Navy, and will do so in future wars. Heretofore, the Navy has been the chief user of oil, and as a result it was always given the advantage of any oil reserve discoveries. At this time, I think the Navy is responsible because it has not developed the Alaskan field, and it knows that the Army has been spending money in territory which did not compare with the territory held by the Navy.

This is a war of the United States and not of the Army or of the Navy, and it is

high time that the Army and the Navy cooperate rather than do as they have in the past. The point that I want to bring out is this, that the Navy, which at the present time possesses the cream of American oil industry in its personnel known as the Seabees, could do a most efficient job of testing and developing this oil reserve. As a real test of cooperation, the Army should turn over immediately to the Navy any excessive wild-cattling equipment which it now has available in the Canol area to be used in the testing and development of the Alaskan naval reserve. Legislation can easily be accomplished to allow this transfer.

If the Navy does not choose to test and develop this reserve immediately, let it say so, and then legislation should be introduced to declare this a military reserve where either the Army or the Navy can cooperate in this development. Let us quit these Pearl Harbor tactics of non-cooperation between Army and Navy. I am sure the Army will be glad to redeem itself by testing and developing this area if the Navy wants to continue its dilatory tactics.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman recommend that the equipment at Canol be transferred from the Army to the Navy to develop some naval reserve in Alaska?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. How about taking that same equipment and developing the naval reserve in Elk Hills? Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. POULSON. The transportation back would be excessive. The distance between the Norman field and the Alaskan reserve is much shorter.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows, as a matter of fact, that under this so-called contract between the Standard Oil Co. and the Navy, the Navy and the Government of the United States are not to get a drop of oil nor a nickel out of the Standard Oil Co. for 5 years, or until the end of the war?

Mr. POULSON. Of course, that is another problem by itself. I am not disputing the facts, however.

Mr. WHITE. If the Navy cannot develop its own oil in the United States, what does the gentleman expect it to do in Alaska?

Mr. POULSON. It has the best engineers at the present time in the Seabees, taken from the oil industry, and it has the personnel to do it.

Mr. WHITE. Why is it not logical for the Navy to go into Elk Hills and pump its own oil?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman from Idaho that the Naval Affairs Committee is now holding a series of hearings on the matter of the Elk Hills reserve. I have no doubt, I may say to

the gentleman from California, that the committee and the Navy Department are going to decide all points in dispute in favor of the conservation of the Elk Hills reserve. If the gentleman will permit me further, I may say that the Navy is in process also of attempting to find out just what we have in the so-called Point Barrow reserve—the Alaskan reserve—not for the purpose of developing it, because, as yet, we do not need it. The time may come when we will need it, but we are going to keep it for the Navy. I do not think there will be any dispute as to whether the Army or Navy shall have it. We are going to keep it for the military use of the American people. In my opinion, the gentleman's point on the other project is well taken.

I am glad the gentleman suggested that we might take some of that equipment over to Point Barrow because it will help what we have up there. We have about 25,000 square miles and in some cases oil is seeping out of the ground, but it belongs to the people of this country and it is going to stay there as long as we gentlemen are here in Congress. We are going to keep it that way.

That Canol project was probably ill-advised. The Army did a lot of things. The gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Oregon and myself thought they were ill-advised when they selected the route of the Alaska Highway up in that area, but they just went ahead without consulting anybody. The suggestion of the gentleman from California may be the answer to this thing—take it over there to Alaska, our own Territory, and see what we have up there. In the meantime we are going to keep it all as a reserve.

Mr. POULSON. I thank the gentleman from Washington. I definitely want to bring out that we shall keep it for the people of the country.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the gentleman from Washington this question: If the Committee on Naval Affairs is dealing with it, why does it come to the Public Lands Committee of this House that has jurisdiction over that matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Public Lands Committee made an exhaustive study of this matter, and a very able study. The Committee on Naval Affairs has the transcript of the record over there and we are relying on it a great deal in determining this question. It is an exhaustive study. They went into that matter fully.

Mr. WHITE. This naval oil reserve was reserved for an emergency for the Navy. If we are not in an emergency now in fighting a global war, how long will it be before we will be in an emergency?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the gentleman from California is to be commended for his suggestion. If we are going to engage in any oil development in the Northwest at this time, it ought to be at the point nearest its potential military use—that would be in Alaska if possible.



The only justification for any oil development by either the Army or Navy at this time would be to make available any reserves that we may have for the military needs of the time. Certainly there is no justification for going out to develop a new oil field for the fun of it or as a general development proposition.

Mr. POULSON. I may answer that by stating that they are paying around \$35 a ton for coal shipped from Colorado and Utah to the coast line and as high as \$60 inland where they use it for mines and other activities up there.

Exorbitant price of fuel has retarded development of Alaska. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] who has very ably added to what should be done in the particular reserves.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the gentleman from California and every man who gives the matter any thought, as the gentleman has, will realize that the value of an oil development, either at Norman Wells or Point Barrow, or any other part of that northwest country, rests upon the location of the oil and its suitability for critical military uses. It is all very well to talk about the reserve at Elk Hills or some place else, but oil in any part of the Northwest country for use in that particular part of the world may be worth a great deal more than oil in Kansas, Florida, or California. A usable oil supply at Dutch Harbor or Salamaua or Salerno is worth more than one deep in the heart of Texas.

Mr. POULSON. The gentleman has brought out a very good point. In fact, with our global warfare today and aviation, it seems to me that it is very important that we have some reserves tested and developed and kept, of course, for the United States in territory such as Alaska, especially since it is the short air route to Asia.

Mr. CASE. As to the Canol project, if there were any justification for it, it would be that the military needs were such that we had to get gasoline and oil at a point that would be relatively safe from attack and somewhere near the possible theater of action. Even that would not excuse waste or excessive costs in the project. However, if the Point Barrow field offers a better opportunity of having a reserve on the ground where we do not have the problem of transport and the time involved in transport, the Point Barrow field ought not merely to be investigated but it ought to be brought to such a stage of development that it could be used if the military and naval authorities determine that we need a supply in Alaska. I hope the gentleman pursues his study of this possibility further and I am sure he will. He is doing a real service to the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask this question for my own personal information. Would the gentleman have had any objection to the Canadian project had it been obtained at reasonable cost?

Mr. POULSON. It is much easier to make a statement after you know what has happened than it would be before, but let us take into consideration the known facts at the time they went in there. All of the geological reports and the testimony of experts showed that Canol field was in extremely inaccessible territory, and that our reserves were in a territory which has never, past or present, been a glaciated territory. The highest point over which you would have to transport oil in pipe line in our territory would be 3,000 feet, whereas it would be 4,500 feet at the Norman Wells project or Canol. The temperature there during the winter is around 70° below zero. The project is in a territory where they had explored for oil and the most they had had was 300 barrels of oil. Further, it was in territory which was controlled by Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, and they and the Canadian Government were the ones who would really get the benefit out of it as far as monetary benefit is concerned. It is true we had to have oil, but there were many things to be taken into consideration which I think should have been given more consideration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I submit my question in another way, and I think it will make it clearer? Does the gentleman have any objection to our obtaining petroleum or petroleum products from any other country on earth than the United States for the prosecution of this war as long as we obtain it at a reasonable price, in preference to using our own oil?

Mr. POULSON. I would be in favor of getting oil from other countries at a reasonable price, but this situation is not comparable to what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman mentions a fair price. It is a matter of fact that after spending \$130,000,000 to develop that field we must pay the Canadian Oil Company \$1.65 a barrel for the oil. Is not that what the record discloses?

Mr. POULSON. I had heard more than that. The money we spend up there we do not get back in retaining any of the property or the rights. We still buy the oil.

Mr. WHITE. Would it not have been the logical thing, if we were going to develop that field, to have gone in and developed the ground and then own the oil we develop, rather than to develop the ground for a Canadian company, a foreign company, and pay \$1.65 a barrel for the oil after we had spent all that money to develop it?

Mr. POULSON. I would think so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the gentleman's point is that if the Army had

examined this matter more closely and consulted the able Secretary of the Interior, for instance, on the matter, or men who knew, they might not have gone ahead.

Mr. POULSON. That is right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe it is all lost. We are going to need all the oil we can get. By intelligent action by the Congress and by the Army in admitting a mistake, if they have made a mistake, taken in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, we might still have good use for the Norman Wells oil. Apparently they had some pretty good salesmen in the beginning, including one Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the Arctic explorer.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, evidently. In addition, what I wanted to bring out is that we should salvage this mistake as much as possible and not hold just a fault-finding episode but try to take that equipment and use it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right. The oil is there and we will need the oil and Canada will need the oil.

Mr. POULSON. Whether it is the Army or the Navy, it all belongs to the United States.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Washington states that we could get some good from this \$150,000,000 investment. I should like to know, when the Canadian company owns the oil and owns the land and owns the pipe line, how we are going to get anything out of it except taking off some second-hand equipment that we put in there.

Mr. POULSON. It is my understanding that there is some equipment they have not used yet which can be utilized.

Mr. WHITE. All we are going to salvage out of it is just some equipment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that after all when the spigot is turned on down at one end it may be very close to some of our military forces and be at a place where we can use it.

Mr. WHITE. I call the attention of the gentleman from Washington to the fact that instead of being a bung it is a spigot. It will make only a trickle. It would not charge one ship.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to say in the first place that it certainly seems to me, as the gentleman himself and the gentleman from Idaho have indicated, that if a lot of money is going to be spent on oil development we ought first to acquire the basic oil rights in the name of the American people. But I wish the gentleman would explain, if he has not done so heretofore, as nearly as possible just what the terms of this contract are whereby the Canadian oil company, or the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, I believe it is, which I understand is partially owned by Standard of New Jersey, gets ownership of this whole business under the terms of this contract. How does that work?

Mr. POULSON. I think that has been brought out on the floor, and the understanding is that all right and title to the equipment and the wells and everything will be retained by the Imperial Oil Co. and the Canadian Government after we have completed it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will they repay the United States in oil for the money the United States has expended? Is that the way it works?

Mr. POULSON. We were going to buy the oil. We have a right in the fact that we have the opportunity to purchase that oil. It is all rather involved.

Mr. WHITE. At \$1.65 a barrel.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to know how the investment of the United States is supposed to be recouped, or is it supposed to be recouped under the terms of this contract?

Mr. POULSON. It will not be recouped.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course we own the pipe line, and the Norman oil fields are of no value unless they use the Government pipe line to get the oil out. That pipe line happens to be on Canadian territory. In order to say that we will not get any value out of it, we have to assume that the Canadian Government will say to us, "You have no interest in this pipe line at all." I do not assume that in any way. Canada has always been fair with us on many things, and I assume that Canada will be on this, and that we will own the pipe line, and also, there might be a great amount of oil there. It will be coming out over our pipe line anyway.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on Wednesday, and all other matters on the Speaker's desk, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and include an outline of a plan for the post-war period adopted by the National Council of the American Veterans Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### FOOD AND ITS HUMAN VALUE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are three points that I want to bring out today. The first one is the importance of meat as a food. The second is the necessity of having our Government fulfill its obligations to the pork producers of this country. I think the Government should do this because it is only a just procedure for it to follow. Another is that if we do not, we

are liable to see a very serious effect upon the future food production of our country. Number 3 is meat versus grain consumption by our people. I would hesitate when I first came here to stand up and discuss vitamins and calories and such complicated names. If I do mention A, B, C, and D, I don't want anyone to think that I have a New Deal alphabetical agency, but I call attention to the fact that the world food conference, U. N. R. R. A., that is meeting in Atlantic City, has publicly announced that they are going to furnish 2,000 calories per day to the people of the liberated countries after the war. In normal times in this country our nutritionists claim we need 2,600 calories per day. It may or may not make a difference whether a person is working or not. I wish to read at this time a few paragraphs from an article published by the Wisconsin Medical Society. We are supposed to need fifteen-hundredths of a pound of protein per day. The heading is "Meat, a body builder." I might say that one of the authors of this article is working very diligently on an experiment to try to show the relationship of vitamins and meat to infantile paralysis. The article is as follows:

#### MEAT, A BODY-BUILDER

(By H. A. Walsman, R. W. Bray, and Iva Mortimer, University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Meat analysis, meat production, and meat in the family food supply are all represented in this author group. Mr. Walsman handles the field of meat analysis. Mr. Bray is an authority on meat production problems, and Mrs. Mortimer is well acquainted with all the home economics angles in the use of meat in the diet.

As recently as 10 years ago, science was unable to prove that meat is a dietary necessity. As short a time ago as 1932 there was no evidence to deny that man could keep healthy on a plain vegetarian diet.

But things have happened swiftly in the last 10 years. Nicotinic acid, which appears in quantity only in meat, has been revealed as the key to the cure for pellagra. Riboflavin, thiamin, and other B-complex vitamins have showed up richly in meat. Studies of protein have made it clear that meat is one of the nutritionally complete protein foods.

And in all, the last decade has made the vegetarian diet as ridiculous as the whisky cure for snake bite. Good health demands a balanced diet, and a diet isn't balanced if it doesn't supply meat.

#### MEAT IS IMPORTANT FOR MANY REASONS

Why is meat so important? Principally, as mentioned before, because it supplies the B-complex vitamins, those accessory food substances which can hardly be obtained in proper variety and amounts from other types of food. As for vitamin A, liver is a good source, though other meat products are much weaker in this respect. Meat is important as a source of protein, energy, and minerals.

But it might be wise to study systematically the vitamins and other elements in meat.

In vitamins, first on the list is vitamin A. An average, reasonably active man needs 5,000 international units of this vitamin. Four ounces of liver ordinarily supply about 7,000 units. Other types of meat contain far less of this vitamin, but samples of liver may even run as high as 20,000 I. U. to a quarter of a pound, so liver is an easily adequate

source. Kidneys are of some importance here, too, for a quarter of a pound supplies 743 I. U. of the first vitamin.

Meats are inadequate in supplying vitamin D. Liver is the only meat form which contains vitamin D in any appreciable amount, and the vitamin content in this respect is variable and therefore not to be depended upon.

Vitamin C, the antiscorbutic vitamin, appears in meats in small amounts. It shows up in the adrenal glands and in some other tissues, though fruits and most vegetables are still the best practical sources.

#### IN B-COMPLEX VITAMINS, MEAT LEADS

But in the B-complex vitamins, meat steps out in front.

Take thiamin for an example. Thiamin (vitamin B<sub>1</sub>) is important for health of the nervous system, and has been publicized in recent months as the vitamin of whole grain foods. Four slices of whole-wheat bread contain 160 I. U. of thiamin, but the same size helping of pork loin contains over 500 units. Heart meat is also high, with about 225 units in a quarter pound, and kidneys are equally good. Poultry and beef supply about 50 units in a quarter-pound helping, and so may help to supply the 600 I. U. which a healthy, moderately active man needs each day.

Nicotinic acid was mentioned earlier as the food element which cures pellagra. It appears in substantial amounts in all kinds of lean meats, but liver leads the parade. A 100-gram serving of beef liver contains 17.5 milligrams of nicotinic acid.

Analyses of foods for the presence of nicotinic acid were originally carried on by experiments with dogs, for dogs must have the vitamin to prevent blacktongue, an animal manifestation of the pellagra symptoms. Later chemical analysis was used, and still later microbiological tests were employed. Every study verified the conclusion that meat, supplying nicotinic acid as it does, is necessary to the prevention of pellagra.

#### EAT LIVER FOR VITAMINS

Riboflavin, which started out to be vitamin G, later was named vitamin B<sub>2</sub>, and then ended up with its present chemical name, is a growth-promoting and nerve-stabilizing vitamin. Liver is one of the very best sources of that substance, and lean meats of all kinds do their part in supplying riboflavin. A quarter pound of liver contains up to 3,350 micrograms of riboflavin, where an adult needs only 2,700 micrograms.

Kidney follows along with 2,050 micrograms in 100 grams (less than a quarter pound), and heart is next with almost 900 micrograms. Even lamb, which trails with about 320, is still substantially a good source, and poultry, which offers only about 150, can even be used profitably for riboflavin needs in menu planning.

For vitamin B<sub>6</sub>, beef liver, ham, and veal are all important sources. For pantothenic acid, liver, kidney, heart, beef round, and ham all rank high in content. Exact values for biotin, another B-complex vitamin, are not yet completed, but kidney and liver are excellent sources. Liver, kidney, and lean beef and pork all supply adequate amounts of choline, the final member of the B-complex, which is important to normal functioning of the liver and kidneys in the human body. Vitamin K, which helps promote blood clotting and prevents hemorrhages, is found abundantly in liver, though it does not appear to any considerable extent in any other meats. It was in liver, in fact, that the presence of vitamin K was first recognized.

Meat is important in many other respects, but in supplying the B-complex family of vitamins the necessity of serving meat in the daily diet makes itself apparent.



## PROTEINS

That roughly outlines the vitamin content of meats.

Now for a look at proteins. How important are they? The 1939 issue of the United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook puts it this way, "If there were any one 'secret of life,' protein might be considered to be at the heart of it, since protein is the essential stuff of which all living tissue is made."

Meat is one of the most prolific sources of protein and at the same time it is one of the best sources. Those two statements sound like a duplication. In actual fact they are not.

Proteins are made up of a number of essential amino acids. Some proteins supply all these necessary amino acids, while others offer only a few. Thus a food can supply a great amount of protein, but unless that protein is made up of the right constituents, the food is not a superior protein source.

Meat fills both needs. It supplies protein abundantly and it supplies the right form.

## LIVER OFFERS PLENTY OF GOOD PROTEIN

Of meats liver is the best protein source and lean meats come next, followed by fowl and fish. General cuts of lamb and pork follow in line, then heart and kidneys, and then general cuts of beef.

All these are complete proteins. They are on a par with other complete proteins—cottage cheese, eggs, milk, and cheese. Peas and beans come into the picture as important sources of supplementary protein, but they do not supply all the essential amino acids which the body calls for.

Energy, measured in heat calories, is the next need of the body. Fat meat, of course, is one of the most productive sources of energy. But ordinary cuts of meat, too, supply relatively high energy requirements.

Here are the approximate caloric values offered by a 4-ounce helping of each of the following normal foods:

	Calories
Pork.....	300
Lean beef.....	170
Fish.....	135

Such energy foods as butter, of course, far surpass ordinary meat cuts in caloric value. But for the backbone of the body's energy supply, the staple part of the diet, meats are unequalled.

## MINERALS COME IN MEATS

Meats are not exceptionally rich in calcium, milk and cheese being the best sources of that mineral. However, fish in particular and meats in general, supply a small amount of available calcium for better teeth and stronger bones.

For phosphorus in the diet, meats, fish, and poultry are at the head of the list, and for iron and copper they are again exceptionally high.

In the light of these figures, no room remains for dispute about the food value of meat. Where science could neither confirm nor deny, science now can assert that meat is one of the best foods that can go on the family dinner table.

## THE RULES FOR MEAT COOKERY

There's no question, then, that meat is healthful. Now how about tastiness? Well, a thick, juicy, carefully cooked steak is one of the finest dishes ever planned, and the less expensive meat cuts can be just as tasty. What's more, they are as nutritious.

Two simple cooking rules insure good vitamin retention and good flavor in almost any kind of meat. The first: Cook all meats at low temperatures. If they are roasted, the temperature should be 300° to 350° F. If they are cooked on top of the stove, they should be simmered. The reason for the low temperature is that meats shrink and lose more of their juices under high heat. That destroys or drains off much of the thiamin, takes away a lot of the flavor, usually cooks the meat unevenly, and reduces the total number of servings a piece of meat will yield.

The second rule: Use dry heat only on tender cuts, and cook with moisture on the less tender pieces. Dry heat will not make meat more tender, though if you have a cut which needs no tenderizing it can be tastily prepared by broiling or roasting in an uncovered pan. But to make a cut of meat more tender, braise, stew, or simmer, either adding liquid or cooking in a closed dish to obtain moist heat.

In point of food value loss, roasting is the most costly cooking process. There is a 20 to 40 percent loss in thiamin and a somewhat smaller loss of riboflavin in roasting except under low temperatures, and even here there is a minor loss of thiamin. Thiamin is the only B-complex vitamin in great danger of destruction by high heats. Riboflavin is more stable, and nicotinic acid goes almost unaffected by high temperatures.

Meat is an easily digested food, and a good food for people of almost any age. There is no evidence that any of the meats produce difficulty of digestion, because experiments show that pork, beef, poultry, fish, veal, and lamb are all from 86 to 90 percent digested.

I also call attention at this time to the feed needed to produce 2,600 calories for human use. If anyone is particularly interested in this, he will get all of the details on page 44 of Bulletin 670.

The table is as follows:

	Unit	Milk cows	Hogs	Laying flocks	Chickens raised	Sheep and lambs	Beef cattle
Feed used to produce 2,600 calories human food—(1) of all feed including pasture.....	Feed unit	9.31	7.66	21.94	29.92	74.47	71.65
Feed used to produce 15 pounds of protein. Expressed in another way: Human food produced by 10 feed units of all feed except pasture:	Feed unit	4.76	11.58	7.05	7.50	38.73	28.68
Calorie and protein index.....		2.54	1.16	.99	.92	1.04	.56

The above facts prove (1) that the hog is the most efficient producer of calories; (2) the hog is third in the efficient production of protein; (3) that the hog is second only to the dairy cow in producing calories and protein combined.

The fact I wish to point out from the above table is that, first, the hog is the most efficient producer of calories; sec-

ond, the dairy cows is by far the most efficient producer of proteins and the most efficient producer when proteins and calories are combined; third, why ration pork when it is more efficiently produced than some nonrationed foods? fourth, why is it patriotic to eat chicken when it should be more patriotic to eat ham?

The O. P. A. never seemed to pay much attention to the scientific facts discovered by our agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

The time has come when we should approach these things from a factual standpoint. I would just like to know why a person is not just as patriotic if he has been eating ham and other pork products for the last 2 years as if he has been eating poultry. If I am wrong, I want to be corrected.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I would not ask the gentleman to yield to offer any explanation for the odd opinions of the O. P. A., but in measuring the relative merits of feed in relation to calories and protein produced, comparing hogs with beef cattle and dairy cattle, it seems to me if the gentleman points out more manpower is required to take care of dairy cows, he should also point out that less manpower is required to take care of beef cattle and that a full consideration of what is the most economic production of calories and proteins should take into consideration manpower and the natural character of the country in producing feed. Obviously there are many parts of the West where beef cattle can be produced where hogs cannot be produced, and obviously you can produce beef cattle with a great deal less manpower than you can produce hogs or dairy cattle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In answer to the gentleman from South Dakota I will say he anticipated me by a few minutes and he is absolutely correct. We must have a practical application in connection with these food-production facts. We want to be careful of any step we make in connection with what is happening now in relation to the hog business and the corn prices.

There has probably been a reason why a third of the pork of the Nation is produced in Iowa and Illinois. They have the facilities and they have the ability to go ahead and step up their pork production as they have so much in the last couple of years. We know there are hundreds of millions of pounds of beef being produced where you cannot raise chickens, or you cannot have dairy cows. We realize that. But we are getting to the point today where we must do two things: First, we must look at it in terms of the amount of feed we have; and, second, we must make the best use we can make of this feed.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I thought I understood the gentleman to say in his remarks that a condition of rest or inactivity had something to do with the requirement based on 2,600 calories per day. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I would quote for the Record at this point from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, wherein there is quoted what purports to be a pamphlet issued by the Food and Nutrition Board

of the National Research Council, entitled, "Recommended Dietary Allowances." It says:

According to these eminent authorities, the protein requirements of sedentary and very active men are identical. The caloric requirements differ, and the inference is that very active men require more sugar, starches, cereals, and fats.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am familiar with this statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has been suggesting some questions, and seems to want some answers to them. I suggest that you submit those questions to Mr. Millard C. Faught, Detroit War Food Administration economist, who heads the "Move Over Hogs, You're Spilling the Swill Club." I think he can answer all of those questions. He seems to be well informed. He is on the pay roll of the Federal Government. He surely must have the answers to all those technical questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He may have the answers, but I want the real facts. I do not know the gentleman, but I will be very glad to write to him if I thought he could give the answers with reference to it. If you think he can tell why it takes points to buy pork but none to buy poultry, I will gladly write him.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield. Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I take it the gentleman is somewhat of the opinion, at least, that I have been forced to come to during the last few years; that is, that we cannot always depend upon the accuracy of the information received from the different bureaus of the country, and the representatives thereof. In other words, the information which comes to us frequently we have reason to know is colored in a way that does not reflect the truth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I have received colored information but not very often. We should not be getting any colored information in regard to the pork situation. I fear we are.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has made an excellent statement.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: What are we going to come to in the hog situation when we have the condition that exists today. I am informed we have at least a flooding of the markets. In fact, I think they refer to it as a glutted market, very seriously affecting the immediate future situation, and the food situation of next year. If the gentleman will permit me, we have the further situation where we now have one of the departments going about and regulating protein feeds, which will not only affect hogs, but chickens and all of those things in the food situation. I know the gentleman has given a lot of thought to it. I wonder if he can help me in this situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is the serious situation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a few days ago told us how he tried this summer to ask them to anticipate what was going to happen. The thing that disturbs me about it is the lack of keeping faith with the men that are asked to produce. Someone in authority should assure or reassure the pork producers of America that they will receive the federally guaranteed price. I have in my hand a letter I received today. It comes from a man in my district connected with the Department of Agriculture program, a man who has spent a quarter of a century working with these subjects. He is not writing any political letter. He says:

DEAR REED: There are many things developing this fall that I would like to see you about. One is the thousands of pigs that are being sold unfinished. Also about the fact that dairy prices have been frozen but feed prices are going sky high.

He also sent me a copy of a telegram giving them instructions as to how to make adjustments in hog-support prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may place this telegram in the RECORD at this point. It is so confusing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, November 22, 1943.

To All F. D. A. Regional Directors.

To All Livestock and Meat Market News and Grading Offices.

If you are asked how requests are to be made for adjustments in hog support price from \$1 under the ceiling, advise they should be directed to War Food Administrator, Washington, and full statement of facts on which appeal is made should be submitted, including the following:

1. Statement as to specific adjustment desired substantiated by (a) statement showing differential from Chicago by months for last 3 years for those months for which adjustment is requested; (b) statement as to whether current marketing situation differs from historical pattern and, if so, how.

2. Statement showing how fixed support price works hardship and interferes with the present marketing of hogs and how adjustment would correct situation.

H. E. REED.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can any Member here answer and tell what this is all about. It will need a follow-up for instructions.

I just wish that the War Food Administrator would explain in language an ordinary man could understand.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. What the gentleman has explained to us with reference to the decision of the U. N. R. R. A. on a 2,000-

calorie minimum diet for the people of the occupied countries will in itself create a great demand for a food supply of exactly the caloric and other content the gentleman has showed us is in pork. The gentleman knows that ration points on pork are high, apparently with a view to restricting the sale of pork. The thing that disturbs me is the announcement by O. P. A. that in spite of the increased production there will be a 17-percent shrinkage in the amount available. What can we make out of this confused situation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It reminds me of an employer who finds himself with too many hands; he begins to look them over to see which ones he can let go. I believe they are trying to do that now, especially with reference to the hog producer at this time. They have the pork and now they give the pork producer the rough treatment.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] the other day called attention to irritating practices and abuse of power. I have been through the same thing. I have here a letter from which I will read just one sentence:

You are hereby notified that unless you take immediate action to remedy this situation your permit will be suspended within 10 days.

They toss power like that around recklessly, power to put people out of business, toss it around like a basketball in a basketball game. I took the trouble to look up the qualifications of the individual who wrote this letter and found that he did go to high school for 3 years. The best job he ever had was one at \$150 a month as a beverage investigator; but here he is up there in Wisconsin as an authority on war foods, writing letters such as this threatening to put people out of business within 10 days unless they do what he says. The Food Distribution Administrator tells me this man had no authority to send out any such letter. Orders like that should come out of Washington. They are tossing this power around most recklessly, and to pretty inexperienced operators when they do as they did in this instance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not their very purpose to create a scarcity? They want less of this, less of that, and less of the other. The gentleman has had a world of experience, practical experience. Does the gentleman believe for one moment that any organization could be so efficiently inefficient as this group down here?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Without a deliberate purpose back of it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not like to question anyone's motives unless I am compelled to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman think they are up to? The gentleman has been telling "the heck" they have been raising. What does he think they are doing?



Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Their motives may be all right, but they have not followed a very desirable procedure at times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not think they are so foolish as not to know what they are up to?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to know whether the gentleman is so gullible as to believe those fellows down there do not mean what they are doing nor intend the result that they are bringing about.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not want to indict everyone under one blanket.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then does the gentleman think there is one of them down there who does not mean good?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say I do not have too much respect for the political agriculturists down there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Those with a political background but with no agricultural background. They never were inside of an agricultural college; they just get those jobs, and pretty responsible jobs, too. That is the reason why I have been wondering why the Appropriations Committee has been appropriating money for so many years to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the country, because the Government does not use the men in key positions after they graduate anyway.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us talk confidentially, as though there was not anyone here at all. These gentlemen here are not listening, just you and I, we will assume. Does the gentleman think that those folks down there are up to any good?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think most of them are; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean some of them who do not hold office?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think a few of them are more interested in the political crop of 1944 than they are in the food crop of any year. This is not a blanket indictment, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There must be one or two good ones somewhere along the line, but, generally, does not the gentleman realize their purpose down there is to create a scarcity of everything so that everyone will have to go to the administration for their daily bread?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, I do not want to subscribe to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad the gentleman has so much faith in humanity. He is charitable.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am glad the gentleman thinks I am. There is one more paragraph to show you how these lead pencil agriculturists get these things figured out for us:

About 12 to 15 pounds of grain must be fed to livestock to produce enough meat and other livestock products to feed a man for a day, whereas 2 or 3 pounds of grain eaten daily will support a man for a day.

That shows you the avenue in which they are proceeding. If I had the time I could show you the influence that the

World Food Congress had when held down here in Virginia. I spent a day with a gentleman who was a delegate down there, a fine man. I have just watched what he was telling me unfold here in this country since that time. It is a blueprint. I see it coming and in just exactly the same way he told me as to the things we ought to do. We are eating too much meat, we are eating too much dairy products, we could and should eat more fresh vegetables. He told me we should use more vegetables, more grains for human food here in this country. I asked him why canned goods were not as good as fresh vegetables. I told him that all our experiments showed there is very little loss of the vitamins when properly canned. As I spent the whole day with him and I got a good picture from him as to how agricultural things should be run in the whole of the United States. The present food program of the United States seems to be following his blueprint pretty well. We are headed in his direction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just stated that someone advised us to eat more. The gentleman knows with butter at 16 points a pound butter is piling up, with beef points where they are beef is piling up, and pork consumption has gone down because they have the points on pork so high that the folks cannot buy it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman I would take the points off of pork. We can agree on that anyway.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4½ minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Paul Winkler, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2

minutes at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my only reason for taking this time is to refer to the remarks of my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a big man physically, he is a big man intellectually; his greatest and best characteristic is his charity, because I do not understand, I cannot see how he can look at what these fellows down here are doing to the people, the consumers and the farmers, and not come to the conclusion that their actions are not deliberate and for a purpose. They know their way about, they are smart. They have seen the result of their policies in the years that have gone and they know what will follow if they continue.

Way back in 1935 when our good friend from Michigan, Mr. Mapes, was with us, the beet growers of Michigan had a meeting over in Mr. Mapes' office. All the Republican Michigan Congressmen were there, as I recall. The then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. WALLACE—he of the “do-gooder” fame—sent two men up there. We wanted an increased acreage of sugar beets so that our beet factories over there in Holland City and over in St. Louis, Mich., could operate at a profit, could continue in business and manufacture sugar. They told us flatly that because Colorado could produce sugar beets with a greater sugar content per ton than we could, ultimately we would have to go out of business; that later, because Florida and Louisiana could produce sugar cheaper than Colorado, Colorado must go out; and that still later, because the offshore areas could produce sugar cheaper than Louisiana and Florida, they would have to go out of the sugar-beet and sugarcane business.

When we asked why, we were told that their plan was to produce things wherever in the world they could be produced the cheapest, at less cost, and that wherever in the United States our workers, our industries, came in conflict with those in foreign lands who could produce whatever it was that was wanted at less cost our workers would have to quit their jobs, our factory doors would have to close. That may have been good for the rest of the world, but it was ruin for America and its workers. That was thinking of America last, a policy which still seems to prevail with the New Dealers.

That was the philosophy down there in 1935. It has been their philosophy ever since.

The gentleman will remember that before the recess from the floor here and from the Well many of us were asking for corn, for poultry feed, for dairy feed,

and we did not get it, although there was plenty of it. The gentleman knows that now some 235,000,000 pounds of butter are held by the Army and that much of that butter is becoming tainted, if not rendered absolutely unfit for human consumption. The gentleman must know that there are 1,700,000 cases, I think, of canned goods that are about to spoil because they have bought them and are holding them out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned goods about to spoil?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Washington that we have canneries in our community. We know something about canned goods. In fact, I recall going down here to Fred Vinson last summer when we wanted to increase wages 10 and 15 cents an hour to hold the people in the canneries so they could take care of the coming crop, when we wanted to increase the cost half a cent a can, which Vinson's men said would only cover the cost of the increased wages and increased price to the producer, and he said he would take it up with the President the next day, which was a Sunday, how we waited more than a week and then were told that we could not get the concessions that we asked, although we had told Mr. Vinson that the crop would not go into the cans unless those increases were granted, not because the canners did not want to can the crop but because they could not do it at the price named.

So in 1944 there may be a shortage of canned goods. Oh, no, my friend from Wisconsin, the plan is deliberate. They know what they are about, and they intend to wreck our small industries, our small businessmen—make our independent farmers come to the Government to avoid bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to point out something that it seems to me always is neglected to be pointed out in all this discussion on food. Sure, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, there are canned goods stacked up in lots of places in the world where our boys are fighting. There is some butter that may spoil some place and has spoiled, and there is probably some meat stacked up in a refrigerator some place down in the South Pacific that we may never use; but we brought it down there because we did not know whether we were going to use it—to have it if we need it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is misstating what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not quote the gentleman.

All of these things are stacked up on all the fighting fronts. It all sums up to this one thing, and it should be brought out in every debate along these lines. The American Army, the American Navy and the American marines are the best fed of any troops, of any fighting men, in the entire world and

of our entire history; and that is what it should be, thank God.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that was an excellent statement, and I do not believe there is anybody in Congress who disagrees with it. What I want to know is why we should not have a food policy which increases and maintains production and which gives us some sort of assurance that there will be all this food next year that the gentleman is talking about this year, which we, who come from the farm areas, do not think there will be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know that there is any curtailment on the part of a farm to produce. We can produce all we want. We have some trouble getting supplies. There has been a shortage of a lot of things. I merely want to point out that in all of these discussions we should base a premise that our fighting men are the best fed of any men in the entire world, and they will continue to be. There will be some spots where there will be some canned goods that might spoil—I do not know how they will spoil in the can—there might be some butter that might melt in the South Pacific, and there might be some meat we will never use in Persia, but I would hate to think what would happen to this Congress or anybody else if we did need it in those places and it was not there. Attacks on that program are not well taken.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DILWEG, from December 1 through December 6, 1943, on account of official business.

To Mr. GIBSON, from December 1 through December 6, 1943, on account of official business.

To Mr. JUDG, for remainder of week, on account of illness of father.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday and Thursday, December 1 and 2, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 1324, New House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the creation by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe, at 10 a. m. Thursday, December 2, 1943.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

942. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; to the Committee on Claims.

943. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill further defining the number and duties of clerks and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

944. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting report on rate-making and rate-publishing procedures of railroad, motor, and water carriers (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. Third intermediate report pursuant to House Resolution 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1438. A bill to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Dale Mc-



Neal; with amendment (Rept. No. 903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. Studley; with amendment (Rept. No. 904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Richard Zielinski and his parents; with amendment (Rept. No. 905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2872. A bill for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard; without amendment (Rept. No. 906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; without amendment (Rept. No. 907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelard Demers; with amendment (Rept. No. 908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3748. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore air field; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3749. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3750. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3751. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the equitable adjustment of the wages and salaries of employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Second Lt. Clyde L. Gillam; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Howard McMillan and Dorothy McMillan, individually and as the legal guardians of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and for Virginia McMillan; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3789. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Fairfield, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3790. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Forrest H. Millikan and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3791. Also, petition of Alex Thomann and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3792. Also, petition of Paul F. Regnier and 99 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3793. Also, petition of the employees of the tool room, Carter Carburetor Corporation, of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3794. Also, petition of Frank Braun and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3795. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of employees of the White House Department Store, El Paso, Tex., advocating freezing present rate of pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act at the present level of 1 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3796. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, adopted at a regular meeting held on November 17, 1943, requesting Congress to construct certain works in the St. Clair River for control of the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3797. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from the Rosiclare Lions Club, at Rosiclare, Ill., and signed by Thomas Rose, secretary, opposing House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3798. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the lifting of any ban on American steamship companies that precludes them either by law or general administrative ruling from the ownership and operation of aircraft in overseas commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3799. Also, petition of the chairman of the T tunnel committee of the San Pedro Civic Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the so-called T tunnel bill, H. R. 3455; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3800. Also, petition of the secretary, the Bar Association of Dallas, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 7, with regard to poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits who hearest prayer, to whom all flesh shall come, breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm; lift the burdens of drab duty from our jaded hearts, changing stern statutes into glad songs; soothe the anxieties of our baffled minds so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth we may face whatever tests this day may bring, free and fearless. Kindle on the altar of our hearts a flame of devotion to freedom's cause in all the world that shall consume in its white heat every grosser passion.

Serving here in the homeland, make us knights of the holy crusade worthy to be reckoned with those who on land and sea and in the air have sacrificed their mortal life to roll back the tide of violence from the souls of men and who, having fought for peace on crimson fields, for ordered government, just laws, and the sacredness of home and altar, have found the peace unshaken by time forever. We here remember them and bless Thy holy name, and pray that to us strength may be given to follow in their train. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Scruggs
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson